DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 939 HE 008 510

AUTHOR Benezet, Louis T.
TITLE College Organization and Student Impact. Perceptions of Organization in the Residential College.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 120p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; Career Choice; College Students; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Governance; Higher Education; Liberal Arts; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Effectiveness; Question Answer Interviews; Residential Colleges; *Student College Relationship; *Student Opinion
IDENTIFIERS College Organization and Student Impact Project

ABSTRACT

This College Organization and Student Impact (COSI) project begun in 1975 studied the impact of administrative organization on the residential liberal arts college student. It was originally conceived out of perennial questions about personal outcomes of student learning such as can be separated from the academic fulfillment of degrees or from career preparation. Personal interviews and a short-answer questionnaire were used to gather data from two residential colleges in nonmetropolitan areas. Three basic questions were asked: (1) What do you see to be the principal purposes of this college and how does the college appear to be carrying them out? (2) How do students in the college perceive it as an organization? (3) Does college organization have impact on students? The findings indicate that students: desire a liberal education, although they may choose majors with various career connections in mind; prefer teachers who have a concern for the individual; prefer a college whose organization keeps a human scale; regard highly an organization that can make its local decisions alone; see college administration as legitimate to the extent that it is responsive to its students and personnel; and more readily accept an adversary model of college governance. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132939

College Organization and Student Impact

Louis T. Benezet

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008 510

Association of American Colleges

COLLEGE ORGANIZATION

AND

STUDENT IMPACT

Perceptions of Organization in the Residential College

September 1976

by

Louis T. Benezet

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
1818 R Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

FOREWORD

The value of a liberal education seems to have become the subject of increasing investigation and debate. Inquiries have extended well beyond philosophic goals and specific programs to a consideration of the nature of the institutional setting itself. From such investigation it is apparent that the structure, the process by which academic decisions are reached, and even the perceptions held by various constituencies -- faculty, students, administration -- are imperfectly understood. Obviously the conditions will vary from college to college, depending on such things as size, tradition, source of funding, and patterns of governance, to name only a few. The following study explores some of these variables as they affect two contrasting institutions.

The long and distinguished career of Louis Benezet, the principal investigator in this study, has given him an almost unique background for work in this area. His service of over 27 years in the presidencies of institutions of widely differing characteristics -- Allegheny College, Colorado College, the Claremont Graduate Center, and the State University of New York at Albany -- provides unique insights into the nature of two widely disparate institutions which may nevertheless be viewed as prototypical.

The paper allows the reader to do two things. First it permits him to compare his own institution with one of more or less similar characteristics. Second, it suggests a methodology for independent inquiry. In his approach the author consciously avoids generalization. Instead, he presents specifics designed to stimulate thought and focus attention on conditions which may well exist at the reader's own campus.

The study was financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation. AAC, as the national association for liberal learning, is pleased to have a role in its publication and distribution, with the hope that it will lead to further inquiries in this area.

Frederic W. Ness, President
Association of American Colleges

PREFACE

The study of College Organization and Student Impact grew out of five years of administrative trauma between 1967 and 1972. Both before and after those years other traumatic events happened, and the pseudo-calm on campus since 1972 carried its special ambivalent message. But the turbulence at the end of the 60's shook most of us into a confused awareness of human dynamics among contemporary college students. Belatedly one could become suspicious even of our labels on the so-called silent generation back in the 1950's.

The 1967 - 72 period let loose at the colleges perhaps five types of student unrest which joined in giving impetus to the cyclonic motion: (1) anti-U. S. foreign policy; (2) demands for ethnic minorities programs and Third World recognition; (3) pressures for environmental, urban and other "relevant" learning; (4) reaction to faculty research build-up at the expense of undergraduate teaching; (5) pressures for freedom of lifestyle and a voice in campus governance.

Those who struggled as college administrators through those years found it attractive to join the public wisdom in the 1970's that students had come to their senses after the Kent State and Jackson State tragedies and gone back to the realities of disciplined study (post-Viet Nam job insecurity is given its share of credit for sobering influence). Yet nagging questions remain. Can social movements of such force suddenly appear and as suddenly die? Was it really a moonstruck period, a spell of what Californians when the Santana blows call earthquake weather? Or did we briefly see the snapping of dislocations that had been building up and are liable to break out again? Now that things are relatively calm, what can we learn of how students feel about the college organization as an agent and symbol in their lives?

Such questions leave no illusions that a small field survey could do more than open up a few issues of contemporary student-faculty-administration relations as an area for social research. It has been my belief during years in administration that empirical evidence of underlying campus dynamics is a neglected field. Whereas other kinds of organizations -- industries, hospitals, prisons, school systems, welfare agencies, city and county governments -- have examined their inner working relationships through myriad studies by experts, higher education has done this very little. What has been done reflects a series of fragmented approaches concerned with either students, faculty, or administration *seriatim*. The study reported on these pages is offered as a modest effort toward encouraging others to go further. In our present time of trial for the survival of a rather remarkable dual system of higher education, it seems wise to learn more fully what our colleges represent to those whom they undertake to serve.

*   *   *   *   *

Exploration into the impact of the college organization on students presented at the outset the prospect of a chartless pre-Columbian sea. Because of that fact early consultation was sought with a leading researcher of intervention studies in organization theory and three hardy perennials of campus analysis. I am grateful for having conferred with each one on his home ground: Chris Argyris, Harvard; Alexander Astin and Robert Pace, UCLA; and Howard R. Bowen, Claremont Graduate School. In the latter stages of arrival at findings, three college educators met with the investigative staff for a day, continuing thereafter as consultants for the report: John D. Maguire, President, SUNY College at Old Westbury; Robert A. Rosenbaum, Professor of Mathematics and former Chancellor, Wesleyan University; and Frank Smallwood, Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs and Professor of Political Science, Dartmouth College. To Mr. Smallwood we are indebted for the commentary which appears as Chapter VI of this report.

The campus visits were expedited by their respective presidents who I trust remain my friends as they have been over the past. Through their nomination, campus liaison was ably carried out by Professor Julia McGrew and Professor C. R. Seshu as well as by the Assistant to each president, Dr. Gregory Fahlund and Mrs. Gail Gallerie. On the author's own campus advice and critique were supplied by his senior colleague, Professor Joseph Katz, one of the country's most experienced campus researchers. Conversations on college dynamics and organization theory respectively were held at the outset with Professors Kenneth Feldman and Charles Perrow.

A small tireless staff consisting of Alan M. Leiken, a doctoral candidate in Economics, and Pamela T. Kydes, secretary and editorial assistant, served in a great many capacities in order to mount the study in broader dimensions than had been earlier planned.

The study was made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation following the review and counsel of Peter de Janosi, Director of Education and Research.

Louis T. Benezet

SUNY at Stony Brook
September 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWARD by Frederic W. Ness ii

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION vi

Chapter

I PURPOSE AND APPROACH OF THE STUDY 1

II PROCEDURES FOR THE FIELD STUDIES 3

III COMMENTS ON THE STUDY METHOD 4

IV RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION 6

- A. Purposes of the College and Perceptions of Their Attainment 6
- B. Student Perception of the College as an Organization 7
- C. Summary of Student Perceptions of College Organization 11
- D. Impact of College Organization on Students . . . 11
  - 1. Campus backgrounds 11
  - 2. Administration response on organization impact 13
  - 3. Faculty response on organization impact . . 14
  - 4. Student response on organization impact . . 14
  - 5. Some comparisons of administration, faculty and student viewpoints 15

V FINDINGS OF THE FIELD STUDIES 16

VI ALTERNATIVE MODELS AND INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT . . . . . by Frank Smallwood 20

VII CONCLUSION: The Student Role in the College 25

APPENDIX 31

Table 1: Campus Group Responses 32
Table 2: Student Perceptions of Organization 33
Table 3: Administrative, Faculty and Student Statements 38

BIBLIOGRAPHY 70

College Organization and Student Impact

Introduction: The Outcomes of Liberal Education

What are the outcomes of the American liberal arts college in terms of long-range human development?

For more than two centuries the small liberal arts campus has been the model of undergraduate education in the United States. To a surprising extent it is still true, although those colleges by now comprise at most 15% of the total national enrollment. The liberal arts college, with its historic roots in denominational and private support, exists today in no small part because of an enduring faith that it imparts a special value to the educational experience. Even though large universities by definition follow a different pattern of organization, their graduate departments think well of the strongest liberal arts colleges, accepting their graduates into doctoral programs and striving to place new Ph.D.'s on the liberal arts college faculties. Yet the relatively high cost, low efficiency in literal economic terms, and limited curricula of such colleges in contrast to larger multi-purpose institutions underscore the question whether their human outcomes are really so distinctive as to justify their difficult survival in the present day.

Impact studies of students in college have a history of 40 years of research reported in over 1500 published studies. These include dozens of attempts to measure the influences of full-time residence, small classes and high faculty ratio, humanistic emphasis, familial spirit, academic atmosphere, alumni loyalty, church tradition and other elements of the typical small liberal arts campus (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969). There is still no solid body of findings that the model as a whole produces an impact making for especially favorable outcomes in a lasting way. Presumptions of superiority in the liberal arts colleges of top prestige might best be filtered through data which show what advantages in academic performance their ability to attract highly advantaged students has given them through the years.

College impact studies first came to broad public attention in Philip Jacob's book, Changing Values in College (1957) in which the author arrived at predominantly negative conclusions on the lasting impact of college. He did allude to a small number of campuses, typically residential, academically strong and unified in mission, that showed evidence of having made lasting impacts on their graduates. The common criteria to this day however have not been determined in ways that might, for example, persuade states to use the small collegial model in planning systems of public colleges, as some of the new universities in Britain did after World War II (The University of California, Santa Cruz, is still an isolated example in the United States). The trend instead is toward campuses offering multi-purpose programs which intermingle liberal arts and sciences with vocationally oriented courses and which may in addition superimpose thousands of part-time commuters.

More and more the delivery of higher education is seen in quantitative terms. Perhaps that is because the putative extra quality of individualized education is still regarded by the voting public as a Tiffany item to be reserved for the wealthy, except when the public's own children may be involved.

Two lines of inquiry stimulated the study of college organization and student impact. One was the author's experience over more than two decades of college administration, climaxed by the years 1967 - 1975. Those latter years witnessed a dramatic change in campus climate, reflected most vividly in student activism against the organization of the college, an activism joined to a varying extent by some members of the faculty. The campus ethos seemed to change abruptly; or perhaps what happened was that we became suddenly aware that the ethos was not what it had been presumed to be. It was no longer possible to give convocation speeches about a community of learners. On campus the administrator was too busy confronting anti-establishment clamors and individual demands. The question arose, if colleges are to continue with such division among students, faculty and administrators, what can be honestly said about those values so long claimed for students as inherent in the residential liberal arts experience? Is organization seen as *ipso facto* bad?

The other line of inquiry has been prompted by social scientists writing about the impacts of the academic university and of its nucleus, the liberal arts college, upon the intellectual character of students.

In the study of organizations, institutions of higher education have tarried behind in the attention paid to various forms of societies, such as industries, hospitals, public school systems and prisons. College administration studies have a long bibliography; such references however deal more often with the bones and muscle of organization than with its vital functions. Most writings on college organization orient themselves toward problems of administrative leadership, especially under its current constraints (e.g., Cohen and March, *Leadership and Ambiguity*, 1974). Gross and Grambsch (1974) approached university organization through analysis of the purposes held to be most important by its constituents. They also compared perceptions of power levels among the different university segments in carrying out the purposes.

Since the late 1960's with their student revolts and the onset of faculty unionization, college and university governance has become a popular study topic. Unlike former administration textbooks concerned with line and staff function, the newer studies appraise different interest and power groups contending for campus position. The politics of pluralism is more often a governance subject than the comfortable older approaches of collegiality and the hierarchies of decision-making (Baldridge, 1971; Epstein, 1974; Perkins, 1974).

Still another type of higher education study is the campus biography which depicts an institution in three dimensions, usually following a series of on-site interviews and meetings. Often some particular organizational problem may be illustrated for comparison with other colleges. The narrative may vary in depth from perceptive news reporting (Boroff, *Campus U.S.A.*, 1961) to the more searching analyses of Riesman (Riesman and Gusfield, Academic Value and Mass Education, 1970; Riesman and Stadtman, Academic Transformation, 1973) or Burton Clark (The Distinctive College, 1970). Such writers have added to our understanding of colleges as organizations coping with contemporary problems and prospects. Usually they do not attempt to look deep into institutional anatomy or to measure educational outcomes.

Inquiries into the impact of college on students have entered almost every element of the student's experience. How they combine to influence intellectual character as a whole is hard to determine because of the time factor involved in following out the prediction of changes brought through education. The most common approach to long-range impact study has been through alumni-questionnaire surveys dating at least to C. R. Pace's They Went to College (1941) or Tunis' Was College Worthwhile? (1936). A more recent example is Spaeth and Greeley's Recent Alumni and Higher Education (1975).

To examine what collective impact the college exerts on the contemporary student has been called an unreasearchable question because of the difficulties in separating one factor from another. Arthur Chickering (1969) identified seven dimensions of development during the college years: Competence, Emotions, Autonomy, Identity, Interpersonal Relationships, Purpose and Identity. How can such abstractions be isolated, let alone more closely examined? Graham Little (1970) interviewed 120 students at the University of Melbourne in perhaps the closest approach to an overall appraisal of institutional impact. He found that students were centered upon personal and career development but that they looked on the university as rather passively providing a place for their exploration. He did not identify a collective university impact; in fact he reported student expressions that the university organization might do well to supply a more active leadership toward helping students develop social philosophies. Other researchers of whom Alexander Astin is currently the most prolific continue to isolate different environmental influences and to perform a useful function in ventilating traditional claims of superior academic influence, such as through comparing student performances on campuses of contrasting prestige levels and finding no large effects of college "uplift".

Some sociologists have undertaken to study the college and university impact in terms of basic institutions of society. The most pervasive sociological force of American higher education they identify as the large prestige university. Its influence is seen as extended to the selective undergraduate liberal arts college whose faculty have in large part been trained in their graduate disciplines at A.A.U. - member universities.

Parsons and Platt (The American University, 1973) see undergraduate education in the university as a socialization of the individual within the rubrics of what they term cognitive rationality. That rationality they identify as a crowning achievement of the educational revolution in the Western world. Under the university influence undergraduate education is seen as part of a fiduciary system holding in trust the intellectual values of cognitive rationality which in turn direct the applications of intelligence.

Parsons and Platt acknowledge that their model, the elite university, is by definition not typical of all higher education; its effects, however, are presented as having been nationally pervasive. To other scholars there appears less reason to believe that the contemporary undergraduate experience has such an embracing intellectual effect. Writing in the same volume (Chapter 9) Neil Smelser reflects upon his experience with the huge multi-purpose, three-level California higher education system. He proposes that for many if not most undergraduates the educative process in the U. S. becomes more like a business transaction, a servicing rather than a socializing relationship. To posit a lasting impress of cognitive rationality upon all or even most of our college-educated citizenry requires a stronger vision of the influence of Harvard and a few other universities than most college analysts could claim. Even in the context of the broadly theoretical nature of Parsons and Platts' social constructs, their model of undergraduate socialization into academic value systems appears too parochial to provide a base for campus research into what contemporary U. S. students feel, say and do under the impact of the college experience.

Handlin and Handlin (1970) describe three hundred years of college socializing forces of varying strength and duration upon American youth. Their appraisal of forces during the period of the past forty years, "economic growth, war, and science", led them to conclude, "Its primary demand upon the individual was the ability to work in large groups...it provides the immediate background for the problems which trouble the college today (page 4). "

For the present study the two lines of inquiry, one personal and the other bibliographic, merged into a project to inquire directly into student perceptions of the collegiate organization. The assumptions made were, first, that since it is impossible to forecast the persistence of college impact over time the best procedure would be to ask students what they presently believe to be the college's impact on them; second, that since claims of higher education's socializing effect (sociologically not politically speaking) relate to the college's total impact, the prime source of that impact ought to be looked for at the heart of the organization. If that assumption did not hold true, the organization would have to be considered at odds with itself and its impact thereby dissipated (our campus findings indicate that such a condition may indeed occur).

Where is the heart of the college organization ? As this report will indicate, many professors hold that the nature of a college is determined by the quality of its faculty, no more no less. Administration is considered ancillary to education. As Parsons and Platt state, it "consists of suborganizations and the people who staff them; it mainly performs functions other than the core academic functions of processing knowledge through learning and teaching" (page 135). The place of the faculty in college impact is underscored by Trow in Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education (1975), although he allows room for student peer influence and for that baffling construct, overall college experience.*

---

* A quotation from an earlier study (Clark and Trow, 1966) gives a somewhat different view: "...The organization of the college as a community has profound effects on student life in ways that have been given too little consideration by administrators and too little study by scholars."

Whether or not the administration of the college should be relegated to the base arts of husbandry as Aristotle's Politics I might have it or whether in fact it holds the keys to the overall college experience is a perennial and to some observers a useless debate. Is it in fact meaningless? In the elemental sense decisions are being made at the center which determine the future course of teaching and learning according to academic programs that will or will not be funded. Having dismissed administration as handmaiden to the scholars, Parsons and Platt were brought to observe, "On the other hand the administration has greater power (as opposed to prestige) in the making and implementation of binding decisions" (page 136). Higher education, like other objectives of public policy, has come under the discipline of the bottom line. Yet if the power of decision does not support the university's fiduciary system of values, the university will fail. Should we then exclude administration from a voting membership in the academic society?

To transmit the administrative power of program funding into an affirmative force in education was not in earlier times thought unreasonable. Durable presidents of well-regarded colleges have practiced the art of submerging their own powers of decision beneath a broad current of campus discourse on educational planning, surfacing the power only when a plan required testing in the light of feasibility or timing. Often they must lead the fight to preserve a program against outside apathy and opposition. More basic in personal terms is a sense one soon gets on almost any residential campus small or large of whether or not it reflects an organization that cares. Nothing seems closer to that risky and tyrannical word, morale. Even the crustiest professor who regards administrators after the sulfurous manner of a Thorstein Veblen will speak to the importance of an organization that shows regard for human beings on campus, perhaps if only in the classic matter of parking.

For these and a chain of attendant reasons we determined that the search for organization impact should be directed at the administrative center of the institution. The college organization for many students becomes the first conscious exposure to what sociologists call a collectivity. Whether it is well or poorly administered, autocratic or democratic, stable or vacillating may bear little importance for effective faculty teaching which most people believe determines the impact of education. But as the most unstudied entity among environmental influences the central organization appealed to the present investigator on two counts. First, it is the summit of decision on the purposes of the college even though some administrators may dodge decisions; therefore it must reflect the college's priorities of educational values. Second, potentially at least it is a working model of an organization committed to human growth. It seemed timely therefore to ask how the constituents of the campus, in particular the students, see the college organization as a factor in the quality of their education.

College Organization and Student Impact

An Exploratory Study into Perceptions of Organization in the Residential Undergraduate College.

I. Purpose and Approach

The study of College Organization and Student Impact was begun in mid-August, 1975 under a private foundation grant. The grant made possible a secretary and a graduate assistant plus consultants ad interim and two faculty liaison persons. The principal investigator's salary was carried by his regular University appointment.

The purpose of the COSI project was to study the impact of the organization of a college on the residential student in terms of his or her perceptions of the college experience. College organization is here used to refer to a social system of persons brought together to attain certain goals (Parsons, 1960; Etzioni, 1964): in this case, the goals of undergraduate education. To focus response to "organization" we directed attention primarily at the administrative core of the college while recognizing that the administration is not all of the organization and indeed may even be characterized by faculty as being the least essential part of it.* The teaching faculty were not addressed in the study as constituting the organization proper even though, as numerous responses subsequently reminded us, many faculty consider themselves to be the basic organization of the college. Furthermore they are often looked on as such, although not necessarily in the same light as they regard themselves, by students, parents and outside public.

The study was originally conceived out of perennial questions about personal outcomes of student learning such as can be separated from the academic fulfillment of degrees or from career preparation. Outcomes, however, involve such long time-frames and so many variables that it was at once evident we could not measure an organization's impact on educational outcomes any more certainly than other factors in the college environment have been measured for their enduring contribution to what an individual becomes in later life. The approach that seemed most consistent with the purpose of the study was directly to ask students, faculty and administrators for their spontaneous answers on the matters we were inquiring about. Most pertinent to the questions were the perceptions expressed by students of what the organization of the college means to them as a part of their overall campus experience. Controlled questionnaires with lengthy checklists were passed by in favor of unstructured face-to-face conversations to be recorded, transcribed, coded and closely analyzed. A short-answer, open-ended questionnaire of one page was used also to broaden returns on one point of interest.

Three key questions formed the theme and the development of the inquiry.

---

* One of our consultants, a behavioral scientist, proposed that we distinguish "big 'O' and little 'o' " in the organization.

In varying forms according to the kind of interview involved, they were posed essentially to the interviewees as follows:

A. What do you see to be the principal purposes of this college and how does the college appear to be carrying them out?

B. How do students in the college perceive it as an organization?

C. Does college organization have impact on students?

During the year's study, interviews on other campuses plus contemporary readings were undertaken in order to determine what relation the study might bear to current questions about college organization and governance. A few of these questions are discussed in the concluding section of the report.

Intervention research, seen in the sense of directly inquiring into campus operations in a manner subject to peremptory challenge, has its hazards. This is particularly true when the observer has invited himself to study the organization rather than having been invited to do so.* On the other hand, higher education, as surveys by Ladd and Lipset (The Divided Academy, 1975) have reminded us, is a highly self-critical profession. What use might eventually be made of the findings of our study remains to be seen and may develop out of the report which follows. The investigator's own interests, formed by a good many years in campus administration, probably dictated the kind of inquiry whose returns might bring out some items for self-reappraisal by the organization and its constituencies. The topic of the study, college organization and student impact, would appear applicable enough so that any compelling findings could be as useful on a large campus as a small, or at a university as well as at a college.

---

* The distinction, as was discussed at the outset with Argyris, creates a different set of intervention dynamics from those in a situation where one part of the organization, typically the executive of a company or his personnel director, has engaged the services of the investigator. At one of our colleges we never quite lost a feeling from faculty members amounting to a polite, "It's interesting to talk with you; tell me again, just why are you here?"

II. Procedures for the Field Studies

Two residential colleges were selected, predominantly undergraduate and liberal arts. Both are located in non-metropolitan settings, not far apart; one is privately endowed and controlled while the other is a unit in a state university system. The project was initially discussed with each president who then arranged for a faculty liaison person as well as the continuing help of his Assistant. Visits to each campus by the investigator and his assistant were carried out semi-monthly between mid-September and late February; one campus received two visits in May because of missed earlier apopoitments. Campuses will be referred to as College S and College W (not their true initials).

During this period interviews were carried out with the following: senior administrator groups (6 persons at College S; 10 at College W); two faculty groups of eight each (College S), faculty group of eighteen (College W); two student groups (ranging from 3 to 18) at each college; individual faculty interviews at College S (6) and College W (14); individual student interviews, College S (28) and College W (22); individual president interviews, College S and College W; individual interviews with academic dean or academic vice president, administrative vice president and student affairs vice president, College S and College W.

To obtain a broader sample of student perception of college organization, one-page questionnaires were circulated in various classes and as follow-up to the individual interviews. Answers were solicited as open-ended, two- or three-word items.

From documents and campus interviews data on each college were gathered throughout the year on institutional history, administrative structure and function including governing board, student demography and student and faculty governance.

Answers by groups and individuals to the questions posed by the interviewers were analyzed from the transcripts of the recordings. They were tabulated according to commonness of answer and from these a pattern of answers was obtained to three key questions of the study (see Chapter V). Following the spirit of a contextual study, quotations consistent with the trends of response were culled from the range of interview transcripts, both group and individual, and were then arranged according to faculty, student or administrative response to each major question. These quotations, nearly 400 of which were taken, are presented as part of the evidence from which interpretations were arrived at concerning perceptions of the organization's impact on students as held by the respective three main constituencies of the campus.

After the data had been collated and before findings had been made, three prominent college educators with extensive experience in both teaching and administration spent a day conferring with the investigative staff on the evidence. They continued as consultants for the conclusions and interpretations of the study.

III. Comment on the Study Method

The investigation of organizational impact on students entailed twelve one-day visits on two campuses between September 1975 and May 1976. The visits produced 50 hours of recorded interviews among nine groups, totaling 85 different persons plus 80 individual interviews which involved 20 faculty, 50 students and 10 senior administrative officers. The one-page questionnaire was completed by 172 students. In addition, the investigator talked informally with other college officers and faculty committee heads and examined trustee minutes, college historical records and student academic and demographic data. His graduate assistant interviewed student government heads and two administrative service officers; he also reviewed past editions of student campus newspapers to note content and trends of student campus response. Face-to-face conversations were thus conducted with a total of 150 different individuals comprising students, faculty and administrators. Questionnaire answers were obtained from an additional 120 students who did not participate in the interviews. Thus 270 individuals gave some type of response within the range of questions asked.

Faculty and students for the group interviews were selected by the respective faculty liaison persons aided by a senior student personnel administrator. Care was taken to invite participation by a cross-section of faculty by field and seniority and of students by major subject and college class. Student interviews were conducted by the graduate assistant and a fellow interviewer according to random samples in the residence halls. Except for a shortage of seniors interviewed in College W*, the participants reflected a satisfactory spread in all major categories.

The consistency of returns from respondents on the two campuses supports our belief that a fair reading of student and faculty perceptions at College S and W was gained by the study. The selection to be sure might from some factor or another prove to have been skewed even though care was taken to avoid it. To have achieved statistically significant answers from a large sample on the campuses would have required different techniques and more narrowly devised questioning. Heisenberg's principle that the experiment affects the evidence would have been particularly applicable; we would have had a response of a different kind, less revealing of individual thought. Since we were inquiring into the individual's conscious perceptions of organizational impact, something admittedly subjective, quantitative methods such as a long checklist questionnaire from a large proportion of the population did not seem appropriate. The process that we used might be called broadly clinical: that is, clinical in its use of unstructured personal testimony in some depth; broad in its use of considerably more than a few subjects giving anecdotal data. The purpose of the study once again was to sharpen the question of how residential students, and faculty as the most immediate source of influence on campus, perceive the impact of the college's organization. Our results indicate that the students and faculty interviewed do in the main identify the organization as an entity in college life; that it has an impact which is seen more often as negative to education than positive; and that in varying degree students believe they should organize themselves as a constituency vis-a-vis the college organization in order to make the most of their educational experience.

---

* Seniors in College W tend almost uniformly to live off campus.

In the ensuing account of findings where figures and percentages are quoted in setting forth evidence these should be interpreted as aids to filling out the context of the findings rather than as to demonstrating statistical significance. Such reinforcements might be broadened in subsequent studies through more extensive inquiries of the sort described here, mounted by a larger staff with more time and resources. As is customarily the case, a leading motive of the present pilot study was to test the waters for a deeper plunge of that sort in the future.

The present study, in sum, is a report of what randomly selected undergraduates in two residential colleges, augmented by faculty opinion, gave as perceptions of college purpose and college organization on their campuses. It is not offered as a measuring device for these or other campuses. In the following presentation, where temptations proved irresistible to extrapolate the evidence to a wider college scene, or to another set of circumstances on the same scene, such departures will I trust be apparent and the author must assume responsibility for them on the basis of three campus decades in different regions of the United States.

The philosophy which governed the approach to results from this study has been epitomized by Harold Howe in a recent speech to researchers in education (1976):

> In education the fundamental units are individual human beings whose behavior is influenced by different inheritances, by varied experiences in life, and by feelings and attitudes that vary unpredictably with changing life experience. Information about human beings cannot be fed into computers with the expectation that calculations will have the predictability of laws of gravity. Even when large population samples are used to "control variables", the resulting calculation has no significance in dealing with individuals and limited application to groups.

IV. Results of the Investigation

A. Purposes of the College and Perceptions of Their Attainment

Consistent with the definition of an organization as a society of persons directed toward certain goals the college impact study was begun by asking groups of administrators, faculty and students to discuss the question, "What do you see to be the principal purposes of this college; and how does the college appear to be carrying them out?" Discussions averaged an hour; participants were assured of anonymity (as was the case in all testimony given throughout the study).

Transcripts of the recordings were analyzed in order to identify the two types of answer, i.e. what the college purposes are or ought to be;* and how the college appears to be carrying them out. The large majority of time was spent on defining purpose rather than on its degree of implementation. Each separate purpose volunteered by an individual was tallied; likewise each comment on organizational action in pursuing purpose was separately tallied. Responses were then collated according to agreements and contrasts.

Answers on college purpose as volunteered from among all six groups (administrators - faculty - students on the two campuses) concentrated on education of the individual (Table 1).** The purposes bespoken in order of frequency were (1) broad intellectual growth; (2) personal development; (3) career orientation. Faculty and administrators favored number (1), students favored (2). In several cases a phrase used, e.g. "broad awareness of society", was expanded in an intellectual vein by faculty and in a personal vein by students; hence no real contrasts of belief could be inferred and all views were considered to be within the rubric of liberal education. Career orientation did bring out opinion contrasts. It was given top priority by no group and omitted by two. One group (Students, College W) discussed it as a proper purpose for students themselves to adopt, utilizing college guidance resources to full extent.

Although college purposes had been introduced at each session as discussable either under educational or institutional headings (cf. discussion of university "support purposes" in Gross and Grambsch, 1974), each group confined its discussion to the topic of individual education. No one volunteered college purposes for public service, social justice or knowledge discovery per se. The purpose of continuing education for outside part-time students was mentioned in one group; faculty productive scholarship likewise was mentioned once (Administration, College S) after the interviewer had asked a somewhat leading question.

---

* Both during the discussions and in the transcript readings there was found to be no discernible distinction between what the college purpose is perceived to be and what respondents thought it ought to be. Exception came in one group (Faculty, College W) where three people argued that the college should hold stronger purposes for career education - a position disputed by the others.

** Tables 1, 2 and 3 are found in the Appendix.

What attention was paid to career orientation gave some reference to student uncertainty about careers. Reading the transcripts brings out the interesting fact that faculty attributed more anxiety to students about careers than the students themselves professed. The consistent trend of students on both campuses to uphold broad liberal education above career preparation -- something we found maintained in the individual interviews -- offers counterevidence to widespread public assertions that students currently are abandoning liberal education for vocationalized study. Whatever the current shifts in subjects being taken may be, student preference for broad studies was consistently upheld on both our campuses. This may be the more marked in that one of the campuses has recently divided its faculty into a liberal arts and two professional divisions.

Volunteered comments on the organization's effectiveness in carrying out its purposes included numerous items of critical appraisal in all six sessions (see Table 1). The administrators of one college (W) offered the most (self) criticisms of any session; the A-group (administrators) of College S gave the fewest criticisms. Volunteered by F-groups (faculty) of both colleges was a Jeffersonian "the best organization is the least organization"; a posture frequently offered was of the mature college community where good things happen merely by bringing first-class professors and students together. Four groups mentioned insensitivy to individuals as an existing organization defect (individual faculty and student interviews expanded on this). In the initial group interviews neither administration nor faculty in College S volunteered instances of inadequate organization; however a second group of faculty in discussion at College S four months later (results are included among the faculty quotes in Appendix A) made considerable mention of inadequacy.*

Individual interviews with faculty and students yielded replies that in no case contradicted group agreements on college purpose and in several instances affirmed them. Nearly all the faculty members when asked why they had come to the college said that teaching undergraduate liberal education in congenial settings had attracted them. Students in naming their "like most" choices places near the top of the list the breadth and variety of interesting courses offered. Criticism of a lack of vocational preparation was mentioned in the "like least" column just once in 50 interviews. Half the students interviewed mentioned general intellectual growth as a change perceived in themselves since entering college.

B. Student Perception of the College as an Organization

(Questionnaire on Student Perception of the College Organization)

A one-page questionnaire was circulated among students at the time of their interviews; in addition, questionnaires were distributed in classes by various cooperating faculty members. Five to ten minutes sufficed for students to write answers to the brief questions. In two or three words students were asked to respond to the following:

---

* In the intervening period a controversy over next year faculty salary increments, yes or no, claimed wide campus attention and once again one is reminded how uncontrolled are the variables of time and local circumstance when campus attitudes are measured.

1. Most people on a campus speak of "the College" many times each week. When you refer to the College what do you have in mind that you're referring to?

2. Another phrase everybody uses is "the Administration". What identifies the Administration for you?

3. A third term often referred to is "college purposes" or "college goals". Who or what in your opinion is chiefly responsible for determining what the purposes of this college are?

4. In matters of educational policy, which we'll define as matters concerning whom, what, how to teach and by whom, what three sources of authority on this campus do you think have the most say?

5. Who or what would you say has the most responsibility for upholding the educational standing of this college?

6. Who or what would you say has the most responsibility for deciding main items of the college calendar (opening, closing, major program events, etc.)?

7. Where do you have the most direct contact with the college administration?

Results: Table 2 (Appendix) gives replies of the 172 respondents, stated in percentages of students who wrote the same answers to the respective questions.

1. The College. We had thought that students would identify "the College" either with a visible human establishment or with the chief signers of policy bulletins in the student's mailbox. Results confirmed predictions but went beyond. Identification of the College by its actual name was noted by 1 in 6. One out of 20 saw it as an abstraction known by one term or another, e.g., "the institution". One out of 7 saw the College as academics: faculty, courses, etc. None of the 172 identified the College as the President.

2. The Administration. Question Two pressed more closely on a term often used as a campus target by students and professors. Answers were polarized: at one end, the President, other top officers, or the board of trustees were identified: at the other end were generalized answers: "people who are in control of things", or abstract symbols such as "power", "red tape", "bureaucracy", etc. A few College W students* identified the administration

---

* College W answers were undoubtedly skewed by the fact that a large proportion of freshman and few seniors were in the sample despite attempts to get an even distribution.

as "faculty", perhaps reflecting a recent faculty stand on campus against having students in the governance instrument. Several students identified Administration with lower level offices of academic or student services.

3. College Purposes. The spread of answers about who or what is responsible had not been predicted. More than one in five students saw college purposes emanating from the Board of Trustees. Even students at College W, where there is no local board, saw the ultimate control group as active in determining educational policy. Top administrators such as President or Academic Vice President had the largest vote (1 in 4); faculty were seen as small in goal-setting. An unpredicted body of answers, amounting to one-third of the total, grouped around "the Students", expressed either in the sense of student organization or of individuals. Views that students should determine college purposes confirm predictions of writers like Howard Bowen that as tuitions rise, so will the student voice demanding more customer consideration.

4. Educational Policy - Who Has the Most Say? Three lines were given for answers to this question, allowing respondents to list: most say, next, and next. Percentages in the answers reflect weighting of the votes assigned first, second or third place. The results gave a 41% plurality to "administration" including 11% which specified the President. Faculty ranked next (24%, plus 8% for "Department Chairman"); students and Trustees (or other references to state controls) ranked almost evenly (10% and 11%), students being given the edge in College W, trustees in College S.

5. Educational Standing. A strong populist vote was returned on who is responsible for upholding educational standing of the college. Twenty-five percent favored faculty, but 35% wrote in "Students". Our student interviews have indicated that on both campuses support is expressed for high standards of admission, and it was reflected in the answers to this question. It was further underscored by a 16% preference for "Admissions Office" as the agent chiefly responsible for educational standing. Only four percent of the answers placed responsibility with the president, seven percent with the board of control, and eleven percent with the administration in general.

6. College Calendar. This item had been added in order to draw response on a subject more routinely seen as administrative. Answers confirmed that in this area at least the formal organization is accorded a primary role. "Administration" received over half the write-ins, plus five percent specifying the President. Even here, students at one college (S) saw themselves involved in college calendar-making (13%). College W students went to the other extreme, 23% listing state system headquarters as being responsible for calendar-making (there are erroneous student beliefs on state campuses that the System imposes a uniform academic calendar throughout its colleges). Faculty were seen as negligibly involved in calendar matters.

7. Administrative Contacts. A final question was aimed at discovering where students had experienced personal contacts with the college administration. Ten percent wrote "little or none" or even "as few as possible".

Nine percent named various campus buildings or offices. One in four listed principal administrative officers, e.g. Dean of Students. No one listed "President" as the point of most direct contact. Nearly half the respondents listed some administrative service office such as registrar, bursar, admissions, residence or financial aid as the point of closest administrative contact. Small percentages named student government, campus communications, department officers or faculty members in general.

Perceptions Reported in Student Interviews

In the initial student group interviews, discussion was started with the question, "What do you see to be the college's purposes and how well does it seem organized to carry them out?" The ensuing conversations focused upon student experience with educational purposes; little reference was made to college mechanisms for carrying them out. Such comments as were made criticized the adequacy of student counseling. Mild dissatisfaction was expressed by College S students with the administration's handling of coeducational admissions. There was brief mention that students at College S in the past six to seven years have won a genuine place in college governance. The College W group was more explicit about administration - student relations. It was agreed that relations are mainly remote; a climate of apathy on both sides was criticized, more heavily on the student side.

Follow-up student group sessions on each campus later in the year were aimed more directly at organization perceptions. The second College S student group expressed need for greater administrative follow-through to enhance faculty-student relations especially out of class, and for more direct recognition by the administration of students as a separate voice in governance. College W students (a trio of campus activities leaders) deplored the vacuum in college governance insofar as both faculty and students are concerned, predicting that the administration would continue to make all the decisions until faculty and students organize themselves to claim participation. They expressed satisfaction meanwhile that students enjoy freedom in the conduct of their own campus life.

In the individual interviews students were asked for perceptions of the organization's impact on them. Their replies are therefore discussed below under section D which addresses the impact question. Ahead of that however it may be well to note that the interviewers' questions about organization elicited several unpredicted replies which reflect a student identification of the faculty with college organization, especially in terms of their alleged conservative influence on the curriculum or their resistance to having students in college governance. Such replies tend to confirm faculty assertions that they are the organization of the college, although not exactly in ways implied by the faculty. Transcripts of both group and individual student interviews reveal numerous opinions that faculty act in college governance in tune with their interests *qua* faculty rather than in the overall interests of the college. Yet the comments made it evident that students considered this a normal way for partisans in a governance composed of differing interest groups to act (see quotations in Appendix).

Another general feature of student response in the interviews was the low level of personification given to the organization or to its core symbol, the administration. The President was referred to by a few students in the sample who had been leaders in student organizations. Yet (although no concordance has been made of the transcripts) the reference was rarely made; the President by name was referred to only a half-dozen times in fifty-four interviews on the two campuses. Mention of other senior administrative officers was rarer still. A single exception was the Dean of Students at College W who taught a freshmen class in which three members of the interview group were currently enrolled.

C. Summary of Student Perceptions of College Organization

From 54 transcribed interviews and 172 short-answer questionnaires it appears that the students associated organization with a wide variety of constructs ranging from the board of control through administrative echelons high and low, the faculty and their organs of governance to the students themselves, seen perhaps in some Tolstoyan sense as the ultimate body politic of the college. Definition and scope were thus variously seen. When policy issues arose in interviews, however, students focused on organization as top administration ("little O vs. big O"), or on the administration abetted by whatever groups might be siding with it on the issue at stake, such as the senior faculty.

In some contrast to faculty, students did not refer pejoratively to organization *per se*. Students saw organization as something to be appealed to in order to answer student needs, such as for providing their campus home. It was spoken of as an entity which might be called on at times to counterbalance faculty interests if and when those are seen to have become professionally self-serving rather than of service to teaching and students.

D. Impact of College Organization on Students

1. *Campus backgrounds*. Discussion of the study's central question may be more meaningful after a brief summary description of the two campuses observed has been given:

Sherwin College (pseudonym) is privately endowed and has served a national clientele since the late nineteenth century. Large trees and the buildings, averaging more than 50 years old, reflect an even growth over the decades to an enrollment just over 2000. Compared with national norms* its 1974-75 freshmen had significantly higher secondary school grades, SAT's, family incomes, social science interests, political liberality and interest in their school's academic standing. Faculty members above the Instructor level almost uniformly hold Ph.D.'s from major universities. The salary scale is near the national top for undergraduate colleges. The curriculum is straight liberal arts and sciences including fine arts, plus a few offerings in education.

---

* from Cooperative Institutional Research Program, ACE - UCLA, 1975.

Requirements are confined to major fields except for a requirement to take a proportion of work outside the major division.

Governance at Sherwin, codified in a widely circulated handbook, makes use of numerous faculty, faculty-administrative, faculty-student and all-college committees to review campus policy. Students as well as faculty are represented on committees for master planning, all-college events, college regulations, financial planning (now augmented by a long-range financial planning committee), a college court and a college council. Two students serve on a faculty committee of appeals on tenure cases; in addition students via a departmental majors committee are responsible for evaluating faculty effectiveness. Students on the majors committee may report both to the respective departments and to the Student Advisory Committee, which is an organ of Student Government. Faculty functions in governance are focused in two committees, one on appointments and salary, the other on policy and conference. The latter committee meets periodically with the Executive Committee of the Trustees which includes the President. Educational policy is recommended to the faculty from a faculty committee chaired by the Dean of the Faculty and including as members the President, Dean of Studies, and three students, one from each division. This broad pattern of campus community representation in governance is balanced by a key clause in the Trustee By-Laws which is variously confirmed in other governance documents: "The President shall have final authority in the internal affairs of the College." He is "executive officer of the Board, administrative officer of the College and chairman of the faculty."

Westville College (pseudonym) is one of several four-year units of a state university, offering baccalaureate programs to just under 5000 full-time undergraduates, plus 1000 part-time. Graduate programs up to master's level enroll some 250; part-time enrollees, largely late-afternoon and evenings, total more than 2500. Undergraduate students, our sole concern in this study, are almost wholly in-state; there are 60 foreign students and about 100 from other U. S. states. In-state student origins are preponderantly in a large metropolitan region 75 - 100 miles away. The college is moderately selective in admissions and, with the increasing state constraints on enrollment capacity, will likely become more so. In the State aptitude test taken by most high school seniors Westville applicants who were accepted (1975) scored at the mid-80's percentile level by statewide norms; their average cumulative high school grade was 85.3. While data on personal backgrounds were not available, the student body economically is predominantly middle class; as on most campuses, student automobiles abound. Ethnic-minority students frequently found to be economically disadvantaged totalled just over 500 in 1975 - 76. Some reflection of financial need among students is shown by the totals of over $4.5 million in all forms of aid in 1975 - 76, awarded to 2884 students with an average amount per student of just under $1600 (the state tuition that year averaged $725). Over 2000 students live on an attractively landscaped campus in low-rise residence halls which, like the college in general, reflect the recent rapid growth of the institution from days reaching back into the past century as a teachers college.

A majority of the faculty, numbering some 400, have doctorates or equivalents according to fields. The state salary scale is relatively high. Fine arts, education, and liberal arts and sciences each has an academic dean who reports to the academic vice president.

Governance at Westville is in transition. The existing format comprises a spread of faculty committees reporting to the College Faculty which meets in plenary session. Of these the Organization Committee functions as the acknowledged executive arm of the Faculty, both formally and in terms of campus influence. Election of its members is a matter of careful faculty attention. In addition to the plenary Faculty a College Assembly is provided for consisting of student as well as faculty members and carrying a variety of consultative powers. The Assembly, however, has not met in the past three years. The President presides at neither Faculty nor Assembly meetings; each has an elected faculty presiding officer. During 1975 - 76 plans were introduced for a Faculty Senate to succeed both the Faculty and the Assembly as the primary organ of governance. The issue of whether or not students should be members of the Senate precipitated a college-wide controversy which during 1975 - 76 remained unresolved. In this year the Student Government Association with its slate of officers was by mutual consent dissolved. There has been some effort to reconstitute an SGA; however the uncertain future of all-college governance has postponed action. A small student Task Force is providing a modicum of interim representation. Meanwhile the administrative heads of the college have carried on the business of planning and policy with the help of various committees appointed by the President, on which faculty and students are asked to serve. Student response to committee function currently is low. A president's committee on financial priorities which includes faculty and student members, working in a year of retrenchment with program cuts mandated by the Legislature, has had responsibility for recommending fiscal and personnel actions.

The boards of control for Sherwin and Westville actively exercise their powers in determining institutional policy and basic program. The Sherwin Board, through monthly meetings of its executive committee, keeps in close touch with the campus. The president refers a broad range of decisions to the board. Westville as part of a state university system is subject not only to the overall University Board of Trustees but to central administration and the Executive Office for budget and policy direction. An Advisory Council of citizens appointed by the Governor meets with the president of Westville but its actual powers are limited to such matters as the campus oversight of students. The state maintains a very close budget and audit control operation.

2. Administration response on organization impact. In seven recorded interviews (five of them individual, two of them groups) senior administrators expressed reservations regarding student perceptions of college organization impact (see Quotations in the Appendix). Comments ranged from "I'm told most students don't even know our names" to a president who voiced belief that the tradition of "shared responsibility" on his campus is a force in shaping educational value. Agreement was general that the chief organization impact is an enhanced learning experience as the result of a well-run, responsive operation devoted to fulfilling student needs, the administrative profile being kept low in the process. To this extent administrators agreed with faculty that organization is important insofar as it facilitates effective teaching. Beyond this, however, administrators in College S saw themselves as keepers of the

college commitment to liberal education and to student individual development. A College W administrator offered another source of impact, "Colleges no longer are looked to for teaching morality and social behavior; but I believe that the teaching of governance is the most important thing a college can offer." He was conservative about whether or not colleges are successfully doing this.

3. Faculty response on organization impact. In 20 faculty and 50 student individual interviews, the question was asked, "Do you believe that the organization of the college has an impact on students?" A frequent first reply was "What do you mean by 'organization'?" The interviewers (by previous agreement) fielded the question back to the respondent with the comment that although "the administration" is a commonly used term for it, people regard organization in varying ways and this indeed may be part of the question of impact. With few exceptions respondents then proceeded to give replies which usually made reference to the administrative heads but not infrequently to the board of trustees, the state system, or to such broader constructs as the physical campus, the prevailing educational philosophy of the times, or to accumulated college tradition.

Four out of the 20 professors interviewed said that college organization has no discernible impact on students: e.g., "A college is essentially its faculty...it's an academic experience...the impact students feel is (from) the faculty and (from) each other." Of the 16 who affirmed organization impact, two saw it as positive: "the strength of tradition"; "governance is an important part of a liberal education".* One saw impact of the organization as in former years positive, citing previous college solidarity, but now divisive and unsettling. Thirteen saw current organization as in various ways negative. Administrative expediency or redundancy were most often cited as causes of negative impact on education. A sample, from an art professor, "The students get a tired or grey feeling."

4. Student response on organization impact. 63% of the students in the individual interviews said that college organization has an impact; a negligible percentage said no; a third either said they didn't know or did not give a classifiable answer. Of the "yes" answers, 30% did not pinpoint the nature of impact. Sixteen percent gave answers classifiable as "mostly favorable"; a little more than half saw organization impact as mostly unfavorable (66% at College W, 45% at College S). Where college impact was seen favorably it was often related to flexibility of style and freedom from hassles. Negative impacts were attributed to inflexibility or to bureaucratic hassles; also to the image of central administration as indecisive or as influenced by outside systems pressures. The private college students saw outside civic pressures analogous to those seen by the public college students in the state central power structure. However, a large proportion of nay-saying students blamed negative organization impact on unresponsive or ineffectual professors (whom it was held to be the organization's responsibility either to admonish or to replace).

---

* The professor who made this reply is a former academic dean.

Students in interviews were also asked whether they believed college had changed them intellectually and personally. Answers most often given referred, on the personal side, to maturation, self-confidence, greater appreciation for different kinds of people; and on the intellectual side, to a general breadth of outlook and a developing interest in subject matter. There was no attempt to ask whether the organization per se had affected, much less effected, these changes.

In the interviews each student was asked what he or she liked most and what least about the college. Answers hint at various organization impacts, although again no attempt was made to pin these down. College S students cited the setting, type and tradition of the college all as plus. On both campuses there was mention of congenial peer relations, flexibility of curriculum and competent faculty. On the negative side were criticisms of dormitory life (noise, and, at College W, fear of crime); discontent with campus community life ranging from flat weekends to "general feelings of tension" (College S); and on the educational side, some question of the quality of students and of academic programs. Negative organization impact was suggested in "like least" entries which mentioned feelings of alienation or apathy in the college setting.

One more indication of general institutional impact appears in answers to an interview question, "If you had the power to make changes here what would they be?" Although the most frequent answers reflected familiar student gripes about inadequate social life and the food, the next most frequent replies pointed at achieving a more responsive college organization with better student input. On both campuses, improvements were voiced as being needed in college educational aims and effective teaching of individuals.

5. Some comparisons of administration, faculty and student viewpoints.

The pertinence of the COSI project takes on life in the spontaneous insights revealed among the interviews with administrators, faculty members and students. Table 3 (Appendix) presents a rather lengthy compilation of quotations from the conversations as they addressed themselves to issues concerning the impact of the residential college organization. Quotes from all three groups are arranged by columns on alternate pages for each college. It may be instructive to note the ability of administrators and faculty both to catch and to miss the minds of their students, whose quoted comments were selected from the transcripts as being typical rather than untypical of the conversations as a whole.

V. Findings of the Field Studies

1. *Most students interviewed at the two undergraduate colleges agree that the organization of the college has an impact on students, but they see the impact more often as negative than positive.* Their perceptions include an acknowledgment of administrative power in decisions affecting college careers. The perceptions of power are ambivalent. The organization is seen as useful in its capability to meet individual needs and to carry out college purposes. It is also seen as often arbitrary, overly bureaucratic and insensitive to individuals. It is seen as too much influenced by outside pressures and by faculty pressures which run counter to students on various issues.

a. *Students show unclearness about the structure and function of the college organization*, unless the student interviewed happens to have been active in organized campus affairs. The president and other top officers are not seen as foreground figures except during a campus crisis. Faculty may or may not be identified as part of the organization according to the prevailing issue on campus and the alignment of interest groups. If faculty are perceived as part of the organization this is interpreted in terms of their exercising political power, not of their organization of teaching *per se*.

b. *Students look for human responsiveness in the learning setting.* To the extent that the college provides such elements as an esthetically pleasing campus, support of educational standards, a minimum of procedural red tape or promotion of personal relationships with faculty, the organization may be viewed as having positive impact. Such perceptions are less often reported than views of administrative organization as having self-perpetuating priorities whose totality makes a negative impact on the individual student. "The administration" as a power symbol is more often used to identify college organization than are college traditions or collective faculty stature.

2. *Faculty members interviewed on the two campuses show support for the college's purposes of undergraduate liberal arts, yet consider themselves rather than the administration to be the primary responsible agents.* They express the need for sufficient resources, personal backing and autonomy in order to teach individuals effectively. They perceive the contemporary administration as yielding to outside material pressures and becoming more managerially than educationally oriented. Some of the faculty assert that they are the real organization of the college and deplore in varying degree a perceived loss of power to administrative control. *In the main they express belief that contemporary college organization has a negative impact upon students.* They are less inclined than are students to see affirmative contributions by the administration and more inclined to term much of it as redundant.

3. *Contemporary campus dynamics reveal a widening division into faculty, administrative and student interest groups, each with its own character of perceptions and priorities.** When some common cause unites the

---

* This finding applies equally to both campuses as do the others listed. The study was not intended to contrast results on a private versus a public campus. As other studies have reported, we found more similarities than contrasts although contrasts did appear.

campus the divisions may be narrowed or even forgotten for the duration of the cause. Community and collegiality remain administration commitments. These are read back to the administration by faculty and students when they press for measures for all-college governance. Notwithstanding that, a prevailing attitude among professors and students is that they represent respective interests which are chronically and almost inevitably at odds with those of the college administrative organization.

a. Faculty members show varying degrees of acceptance of adversary versus collegial relationships vis-a-vis the administration. Their resentment of managerial constraints on resources and growth is matched by a resistance to the perceived encroachment by administration into policy affecting teaching and learning. Faculty discontents are generally made known to students, not infrequently by statements such as may appear in the campus newspaper. Whether or not these faculty statements affect student perceptions of organizational impact is a matter of conjecture. The testimony makes evident however that when students criticize the character of their education they place responsibility as often on the faculty as on the administration; or else at various junctures they may not choose to distinguish between them, or perhaps may see no important distinction.*

b. College administrators in the study speak of lowered expectations for personalized leadership, collegiality with faculty or belief in favorable college organizational impact, in comparison with administrative statements of former years. Financial problems have sharpened the edge of managerial decision in areas that directly affect faculty careers. Administrators encounter a mounting skeptical reaction on campus to their expressions about shared responsibility in governance. Pledges of open communication and appeals for an understanding of fiscal realities are apt to bring mixed returns: "That's what they say, but look at what's happening." Faculty acceptance of a basic urgency in fiscal constraints is hard to gain; arbitrary diversion of resources to non-instructional (therefore redundant) ends is persistently claimed.

Presidents and deans speak of impact not in terms of their own lengthened shadows so much as of a responsibility for undergirding liberal education and individual student growth. The dilemmas of decision-making among dissenting groups on campus have become clearer. The past ten years have made it more evident that administrators will be called on at times to side with students rather than with faculty on changes in program and policy. Few illusions are voiced about preserving administrative popularity. Decisions are often seen as being between two rights or between varying degrees of undesirable choice. Cliches like "the bottom line" and "a no-win (or zero-sum) game" have arrived at the college administration building.

---

* Until the early twentieth century any professor might on occasion be considered part of the college organization and would then discipline a student in the name of the institution if the president was not available to do so. As student personnel officers grew out of the college deanship faculty expressed relief at being released from student discipline. At the same time the professional personnel officer has rarely been accorded full citizenship in academic society and is not seldom used as a target of faculty anti-administration marksmanship.

c. Students express untroubled reaction to the idea of a college marked by diverging faculty, student and administration interests. From the faculty, students ask for attention to individual teaching. From the administration they seek congenial living conditions and a resourceful educational program freed from constraints and hassles. Such aims may lead at one time to linkages with faculty, at another with administration (in tenure cases students cite instances of siding one way or another according to the particular case and the students' opinion). By their comments students indicate a reliance upon the principle of negotiation among the three groups. For this, many see a free-standing student organization as essential. Failing that they indicate that it is up to the student to look out for himself or herself. As one said, "The college is not going to lead you by the hand."

d. Students, faculty and administration at both colleges concur that a broad liberal arts education should remain the first purpose of undergraduate education. To carry out that purpose effectively appears to be one cause that can unite all three groups and thus may give hope of a combined positive organizational impact. Differences occur not in the priority to be assigned liberal education in the B. A. curriculum but in two implementing questions: the place, extent and method of career guidance; and the amount of individual attention to students to be reasonably expected of professors.

4. Responses gathered from over 250 individuals on two undergraduate campuses did not provide definitive answers regarding the nature or origin of the residential college's organizational impact upon the student. Whatever impact occurs it seems clear is not personalized in the organization's leaders (as in former years on homogeneous cohesive campuses) nor is there a strongly evident student sense of tradition. That an impact does register was expressed by nearly all the students. The evidence that one college organization can make an impact different in character from another's was also clear. What makes the impact firm and positive rather than either uncertain or negative? It appears to relate to student desires for a sensitivity to individual needs and for a college flexibility to meet those needs; yet also for high standards of teaching, clarity of purpose and willingness of the organization to take a reasoned stand on issues. Among the 80 individual interviews just two, one student and one professor, gave answers indicating that education might be better done if there were no formal organization at all.

5. There is pervasive disagreement among students, faculty and administrators about what the college organization means or what it comprises. In an industrial corporation or a government agency line and staff, managers and employees, duties and prerogatives may be spelled out by charter or contract. Faculty ideas about college organization persist from days of its medieval origins when, it is held, the faculty were the organization both in composition and power (this view reflects historical omissions but it remains a stereotype of the medieval university). The current confusions also appear to reflect conflicts about who shall set the missions for the college and who shall determine the resource allocations. Third, the confusions indicate a collision course between the trend toward faculty unionization and traditions of faculty collegiality. In general our finding was that "organization" when referred to within a college is given a negative connotation by most persons. Perhaps this is

because its modern meaning is unclear or perhaps because it seems in the current day all too clear. On the other hand a term such as "the College" may arouse positive response reflecting some personal identification that a student or professor quite genuinely feels.

VI. Alternative Models and Institutional Impact

Frank Smallwood, Dartmouth College

The foregoing findings make it clear that a large number of students (almost 2/3 of those interviewed) indicated that they are aware that college organization has a considerable impact on their college education. In many respects, this is an encouraging finding since it was an open question at the beginning of the study whether most students would be aware of any institutional impact at all. However, on the negative side, the majority of those students who were aware of an impact tended to view this in unfavorable terms which raises a basic question of whether we can manage to build into our residential colleges a model for institutional organization that will permit human growth as well as survival.

This is, of course, an age old question which has been discussed over the course of recorded human history, and we have a number of ideal models upon which we might draw to emphasize the different extremes to which people have viewed the concept of community in an institutional setting. On the one hand, we have the idealized model of the ancient polis which has been described by such observers as H.D.F. Kitto as follows:

> The Greeks thought of the polis as an active, formative thing, training the minds and characters of the citizens; we think of it as a piece of machinery for the production of safety and convenience. The training in virtue, which the medieval state left to the Church, and the polis made its own concern, the modern state leaves to God knows what.
>
> "Polis,", then, originally "citadel," may mean as much as "the whole communal life of the people, political, cultural, moral" -- even "economic...." (The Greeks, H.D.F. Kitto, Penguin Books, 1951)

As a result of the rapid advances of modern technology, more recent observers have taken a quite different view of the concept of corporate community than that of the ancient Greeks. To summarize very briefly, the argument has been developed that technology has advanced to a point where the concept of an institutional community is no longer necessary to meet basic human needs, a theme which has been developed by such contemporary analysts as Kenneth E. Boulding:

> We can even visualize a society in which the population is spread very evenly over the world in almost self-sufficient households, each circulating and processing everlastingly its own water supply through its own algae,

> each deriving all the power it needs from its own solar batteries, each in communication with anybody it wants to communicate with through its personalized television, each with immediate access to all the cultural resources of the world through channels of communications to libraries and other cultural repositories, each basking in the security of an invisible and cybernetic world state in which each man shall live under his vine and his own fig tree and none shall make him afraid. There may be a few radioactive holes to mark the sites of the older cities and a few interesting ruins that have escaped destruction. This vision is, of course, pure science fiction, but in these days one must not despise science fiction as a way of keeping up with the news. (The Death of the City: A Frightened Look at Postcivilization)

Each of the above represents an extreme position, and hopefully the ideal concept of contemporary collegiate community might be somewhere between these two different views. As the previous analysis has indicated, the majority of students contacted in the COSI study harbor negative perceptions with respect to institutional impact. This raises key questions as to what kind of further research could be done on different institutional models to help us create collegiate institutions which promise to have a more positive impact both upon the student needs and students perceptions in the future.

The following is a suggestive list of some of the factors that might provide a meaningful basis for future research:

1. College students obviously work within a series of different social environments which involves considerable contact with both other students and with faculty personnel. By and large, the COSI study indicated negative faculty feelings towards the organization of the college. To provide a few sample quotes of faculty reactions:

> "College organization is essentially a private thing between students and faculty and the less administration there is the better."
>
> "Administrative ideas may be incompatible with what the individual faculty or groups of faculty may wish to do, so this aspect in a very practical sense interferes."
>
> "A college is essentially its faculty."
>
> "If anything, organization gets in the way of either defining purpose or carrying out purpose."
>
> "Here there is a sense of the enemy being within us."

> "There has to be an attempt to recapture some of the authority and power that the faculty, in effect, gave away."
>
> "What I am most afraid of is organized organization. I would much prefer disorganized organization."

Since faculty members are an important socializing element within any college community and students obtain many of their ideas and perceptions from the faculty, we need to develop a better understanding of what could be done to improve channels of communication between all three components of the collegiate community -- faculty, students and administration. One alternative model that might be explored, for example, would be to increase direct student communication with, and understanding of, the organizational elements of the collegiate community, including better information on governing structures such as boards of trustees, key administrative officers, services provided, and the like. In short, we need to know whether more creative administrative communications with students could help to produce more positive response from students on the issue of institutional impact.

2. A second finding which emerged from the study is that many students gain their overall perceptions of and feelings towards the entire institutional setting from specific contacts with individual members within the college organization. In essence, students become involved in institutional hassles with respect to registration, financial aid, purchase of meal tickets and the like. Through these encounters with the "street level bureaucracy" of the institution, students can develop negative feelings towards the entire institution. To put it another way, few students indicated direct contact with high level administrative officers such as the President of the college or his chief executive staff. Instead, most looked to the "street level officers" as the personification of the institutional interface with the student body.

   If we are to develop models for collegiate institutions that permit human growth as well as survival, it seems essential that one prerequisite involves the establishment of internal policies which permit and encourage personal growth on the part of individual staff and administrative employees within the college. Unless such growth opportunities are present within the organization itself, it is difficult to perceive how institutional employees will give positive signals to the student community with respect to the organization's overall purpose and mission.

3. The interviews disclosed a fairly high level of interest on the part of students with participatory democracy which would enable them to become more involved in institutional decisions which affect their lives. For example, note the following types of quotations:

> "The fact is that things are determined mostly by the faculty and that is one thing I have found very frustrating."
>
> "I thought there would be more interaction between student government and the faculty on how decisions are made."
>
> "Why is it that we never hear why the students never get a voice or the power to vote on something as major as money or whether to hold on to a teacher?"
>
> "I will give you an example of this proposal that we had: that the student should have a voice in the government. What happened was that faculty were afraid of students and what they were saying."
>
> "We have effectively no student government...that is mostly the students' fault."

As the above quotations indicate, there is an expressed desire to become more involved in decisions of the college, although there is an ambivalence as to whether or not students should bear responsibility for promoting such involvement, or whether they are helpless to effect any significant changes in the status quo. The issue of student involvement in institutional decision-making raises a host of questions with respect to the efficacy of institutional impact on students which represents a ripe field for further study.

4. Somewhat paradoxically, in addition to expressing the desire to become more involved, noted above, many students complained that the college organization did not provide enough leadership, and a number of students invited more aggressive leadership at the institutional level. This, again, is captured in quotes such as the following:

> "I came here for a little pre-orientation, and the President gave a speech to us about the school. The Dean of Students came in...but now, no one is out there talking to anybody anymore."
>
> "A lot of people feel that the president should respond to the needs of the college community."
>
> "The ultimate decision is the president's, but the majority of times they have just let the decisions of the committee ride unless they really go against what he wants."

> "The president leaves us mostly on our own. And, he does that with most groups of the college -- faculty, students -- he leaves them on their own. He doesn't provide direction."

> "I don't always see the faculty taking as much of a leadership position or getting themselves included as much as I would hope, except to protect their own narrow interests as far as wages go and their own positions of power on joint committees."

Once again, the above types of quotations indicate that many students feel that some type of leadership direction is essential to effectuate meaningful participation and involvement on the part of student groups. The relationship between leadership initiative as it relates to the development of participation is another promising field of research which could shed light upon the development of more effective models of institutional decision-making as it impacts on student growth.

To summarize the overall results of the study, a key finding related to the fact that 2/3 of the students were aware of an institutional impact upon their educational development. However, the majority of these students interpreted this impact in negative terms, and expressed the belief that it was more of a hindrance than a help in terms of their own personal growth. The above areas of speculation indicate fields where additional research might be undertaken to explain the anti-institutional bias which was uncovered in the study and help to create more meaningful institutional models which will promote a more positive impact for personal growth and development on the part of students in the years ahead.

VII. Conclusion: The Student Role in the College

Our study which began with the traditional question about personal outcomes from the residential liberal arts college was eventually conducted as an inquiry into what impact the college organization may make on the undergraduate. The hypothesis proposed was that the organization's impact could be what helps distinguish one college from another. The evidence we gained about student perceptions indicates that the college administration, wherever it may stand in the 1970's, is both perceived and evaluated as part of the total experience, and that most though not all students see it as having impact separate from faculty impact. It indicated more than this, however, about how the contemporary student views the college.

This concluding section concerns personal interpretations prompted by our study of college organization and student outcomes but projected upon a screen of higher education at campuses small and large around the country in the current times.

Organizational studies of higher education, insofar as they have included students, still proceed upon presumptions of the apprenticeship model which to be sure are interrupted by revolts now and then. In the present day a very small percentage of graduates of colleges and universities will go on to become professional scholars. We are not even sure that all who do go on will be placed. Most graduates will go into any of dozens of other careers. Their main desire in college is to grow up as whole persons able to cope in a world of somehow darkening prospects as they view them. At college the hierarchism of the academic guild, however, still remains. It governs faculty priorities and the kind of evaluation that faculty place on undergraduate performance. The student, knowing he will be judged by professional standards, often finds it harder to summon up the amateur enthusiasm for learning that has traditionally been associated with liberal education.

Today's students are aware of a job market that is not prepared to accept all of the close to one million bachelor's degree holders annually produced by what Trow by 1970 had termed mass higher education. The competition cuts back into the college, sharpening job-getting criteria such as the student's four-year grade-point average compared with those of his classmates. Most students accept the contemporary fact of postgraduate job competition. One result is for them to ask more explicitly what faculty and the administration will do to help the student make the bridge to a career. Traditionally the liberal arts professor has not considered that as part of his job. Students may variously accept this but their response is to pose the question, "What's next for me?" more directly to the college organization. Currently they are paying more attention to marketable major fields. Still most of them hold to the belief that a liberal arts education is the best base for coping in the modern world.

The 1970's have brought to the student not only job competition but increased personal costs of education and a broader mix of student body including an increased average age which reflects late-bloomers, returning adults, part-timers and war veterans. The stereotype of the pink-cheeked uncritical adolescent is becoming, along with college *in loco parentis*, something appropriate to former decades. Contemporary undergraduates whether or not they are part of the Youth Culture as identified by Keniston, Coleman and others are voting citizens with priorities of their own. To a considerable degree they have become vocal consumers of education, surer of their own interests and impelled to make their input into shaping the college experience. On some campuses to be sure that posture is more fully accepted than on others. But on nearly all campuses assumptions about college impact need to be ventilated by harder questions concerning input, process and outcomes.

Our past year's observations on two undergraduate campuses underscore the observation by Smelser in Parsons and Platt's *The American University* (1973) that their elite university pattern does not stretch over the fabric of the contemporary American college and university (see Introduction, page ix). Even at "Sherwin", the one of our two colleges which would fit the Parsons and Platt elite model, our findings showed incongruities with the description of undergraduates as becoming socialized into the university system of cognitive rationality. Student interviews spoke to us more in existential terms of a testing-out of academic systems against outside value systems which throughout college years continue an impact of their own as socializing forces of a different kind. To pick just one example, the broadening of clienteles into socio-economic and ethnic groups from which American colleges now draw a large share of their annual ten million students has brought an impact whose force we have barely begun to measure and whose resolution with the academic world may be the most important question facing higher education in the remainder of our century.

On the campus, faculty self-interest has been accentuated by defensive moves toward protecting their particular field specialties. The collegiality on which the socializing power of the university has depended has been under major stress as the fiscal crunch increases, adding yearly to the weight of what by now is being flatly called management decision. Two of the outcomes are a greater concern for professional status and a disinclination to spend time with undergraduate students.

Faced by a more actively critical student body and a faculty who even on the most congenial campus may be latent adversaries, the president's stance shows fading resemblance to older campus postures. His or her response may be (1) to minimize modern facts of organizational life and continue to preach collegiality and "shared responsibility" while retaining full powers of executive action; (2) to become increasingly managerial, assuming a quasi-industrial position with the faculty as an acknowledged adversary group to be dealt with through negotiations which are softened *ad interim* by various collegial rites; (3) to proceed as democratically as the situation permits, recognizing multiple interest groups and pluralism; (4) to affirm that the American college remains *sui generis* and to try to devise a set of governance instruments that somehow serve both organizational necessity and the concerns of the several constituencies on campus.

The findings from this pilot study point toward a need for systematic investigation into the role of the contemporary college student as an active participant in the organization of teaching and learning. Although the student revolts which burst upon the scene in the mid-1960's have been analyzed by many writers of the early 1970's, the findings have had effect mainly in the curriculum and very little in the restructure of college organization. College impact studies over four decades have proceeded on the basis of the student as bringing individual input into the college but as thereafter being rather passively subject to a constellation of college influences. Robert Pace (1975) proposed that a better understanding of what happens in educational development could come from tracing the stage-by-stage conscious interaction of the student with the elements of his college environment. In the same vein theories of college organization might be evolved on the premise of the student as active partner in governance along with administrators and faculty members. Enough campuses by now are working at such a governance so that the idea is no longer *a priori* treason.

The impact of the college organization seemed an appealing question as an understudied example of interaction with students during their college years. Although testimony of students in the present study shows some as accepting phlegmatically whatever the organization might offer, the more common reaction reported was that students feel they ought to have a voice in how their college experience should be arranged. This expression of views was refreshing and rather more than expected. It seemed more refreshing, in fact, than the misty portraits of Alma Mater's enduring impact upon her sons and daughters wherever they may roam.

It had been thought that our study might show something about the extent to which the organization of the college is perceived by students as a model of a working human society good, bad or indifferent. Such a level of generality may exist among students; if so, our limited inquiry did not reach it. The preponderant evidence that organizational impact on students is negative may be viewed as distressing or it may be dismissed by weary administrators as typical of current student posture toward authority in a time when most institutional moves of education and society appear to be in question. What came to light in this study was a more dynamic response: *The view that college organization is neither better nor worse than any other kind of organization, but that a college can be made better or worse according to the degree of responsibility that students as part of that organization take on in their own legitimate interests.* Here, it seems conceivable, may lie implications for education in a democracy that have not thus far been made explicit in college impact literature.

An invitation for new organizational study in the college presents itself. Unlike the factory worker or the civil service employee, the student is patron and consumer of as well as subject to the organization. Unlike the hospital patient who also is patron and consumer, the student is in condition to participate actively. The position of students as part of the college organization seems unique; and the gaps in college organization theory suggests that the uniqueness of the student element waits for analysis.

Further studies of student and also faculty response to the organization on a larger number of campuses distributed according to size, nature and level of academic program, residential character, student clientele and type of control might yield data of significance on the following questions among others that could be asked:

1. Are there solid moves on the American campus toward student organization as a segment of college governance, or is it a passing, perhaps cyclical thing? What changes in organizational behavior can be reported at student-participating colleges thus far?

    a. To what extent do undergraduates view their participation or their representation in college governance as a factor in their education?

2. Is there a relationship between student appraisal of administrative processes involving students and their overall judgments of college impact?

3. Can relationships be found between student response to the college organization and the choice of college major, campus activities, home backgrounds or career plans?

4. What impact is recent administrative advance in information systems, cost-effectiveness studies, and other management innovations making upon education and campus response as perceived by students and faculty?*

5. What impacts does a broadly representative college governance appear to have upon (1) trustees; (2) the educational program; (3) community relations; (4) faculty and student judgments of college effectiveness?

6. What impacts does a strongly centralized governance appear to have in the same areas?

7. Can a series of all-college conferences on liberal education, carried out on each of a number of campuses, prove useful to clarify faculty, student and administrative purposes in concrete ways?

A Concluding Word

The residential liberal arts college in America as Handlin and Handlin remind us (1970) has struggled during 35 decades to persuade the public of its usefulness in preparing citizens and not only the scholar or the preacher. In our decade the doubts again have resurged. However useful this form of higher education may be to today's college-going millions is a question that needs to be approached through evidence rather than by sentiment pro or con. The investment involved in an answer favoring residential liberal education runs into billions of dollars which will not grow less. As alternatives the nation now has options of non-resident, larger-unit, partially automated, work-oriented, self-teaching and shorter-run forms of postsecondary learning.

---

* A study of factors involved in this question is under way at the Higher Education Research Institute under the direction of Alexander Astin and his associates, Westwood, Los Angeles.

The year's study of two campuses, one private, one public, that has been reported here should presume nothing further than a concluding glimpse at what a sample of its students had to say about the organizational impact of the college on them (see Appendix for some of their own language).

- Students desire a liberal education although they may choose majors with various career connections in mind.
- Students prefer teachers who will take time to teach them as individuals both in and out of class.
- Students prefer a college whose organization works at keeping a human scale throughout its campus processes.
- Students have regard for an organization that can make its local decisions rather than leaning on outside controls.
- Students see college administration as legitimate to the extent that it is responsive to the individuals and groups that make up a campus.
- Students more readily than faculty members or administrators accept an adversary model of college governance. They see direct representation of students and faculty at the campus policy level as necessary for effective education.

The last item in the list reflects a belief that liberal education has frames of reference for students that are different from the interpretations by professors and that student input into the arrangement of subject matter helps make education real for them. Some faculty call this a holdover from the protest years when students demanded relevant learning and administrators (not professors, it is retold) complied. In the opinions of these faculty the standards of liberal education accelerated their decline at that time. Other faculty members say that student input has been a good thing. Thus the ancestral debates over whom, what and how to teach in college persist.*

This study has focused on what students think about the impact of an educational organization on their lives. Do they see it as a weakening thing? In some ways, yes. Does it negate the future for residential colleges? Our conversations stopped short of any such predictions. One final datum from the study however may give a clue. In the brief questionnaire on organization completed by 172 students (Chapter IV, page 8, ff.) they were asked, "Who or what would you say has the most responsibility for upholding the educational standing of this college?" We had expected that "Faculty, "Administration", or "Trustees", in that order, might lead the answers. We were entirely surprised. On both campuses by far the largest number of respondents wrote in, "Students". The answer was confirmed by interviews in which students spoke of their need to have access to college policy starting with the office of admissions. If that answer is a reliable expression of what students believe about their stake in college, it is one of the more positive signs we received. It could in fact point toward a kind of college organization that in terms of present student thinking can make impact upon them for tomorrow as well as for today.

---

* For a survey of American higher education's prospects presented in a comprehensive and conventional mode by leading academic spokesmen, see the two-volume Daedalus compendium American Higher Education: Toward an Uncertain Future (1974 - 75).

The concluding suggestion which emerged from the study findings is not a bemused misreading of student perceptions as the fount of organizational wisdom. To report perceptions of organization on a campus is not the same as reporting what that campus organization objectively is or what it does. We began the study with an assumption that many students in the past decade may have been preconditioned by world events to suspect organizations in almost any form. Our campus findings confirmed that assumption and added evidence of faculty reinforcement as well. If colleges are to persist in their purposes the matter cannot rest there. It was another positive sign of the study that all three constituencies of the liberal arts college believe its purposes should be sustained. Out of that unity, at least, new and better arrangements of college organization can perhaps yet be found.

Louis T. Benezet

SUNY at Stony Brook

September, 1976

APPENDIX

Table 1: Responses Volunteered in Six Campus Groups During Discussions of College Purpose and Organization

Table 2: Student Perceptions of the College Organization: Sherwin and Westville Questionnaires (response by percentiles)

Table 3: Findings of the Study as reflected in Administrative, Faculty and Student Statements

TABLE 1.
Responses Volunteered in Six Campus Groups During Discussions of College Purpose and Organization

COLLEGE PURPOSES

Groups	A-S	A-W	F-S	F-W	St-S	St-W	Total Times Volunteered
Intellectual Growth	3	4	6	9		2	24
Personal Development	4	1		5	7	1	18
Career Orientation		2		3	1	2	8
Student Satisfaction		2			1		3

APPRAISALS OF ORGANIZATION

Organizational Appraisal:	A-S	A-W	F-S	F-W	St-S	St-W	Total Times Volunteered
Effective	5	1	2		1	1	10
Democratic	2						2
Minimized	6	4	2	4			16
Authoritarian		2	2	1		1	6
Inadequate or Ineffectual		7		4	3	2	16

Legend: A = Administration Group
F = Faculty Group
St = Student Group
S = "Sherwin" College
W = "Westville" College

Table 2: Student Perceptions of the College Organization

SHERWIN & WESTVILLE QUESTIONNAIRES (response by percentiles)

I. The College: refers to what?	N=60 Westville	N=87 Sherwin	Total%	N=41 Freshmen	N=39 Seniors	N=26 Humanities	N=62 Social Sciences	N=26 Sciences
Trustees or Central System		1	1/2					
The President								
Administrators (Power People)		21	12	17	15	16	18	16
Administrators (Service People)								
Academic Life in General (faculty, courses, etc.)	18	14	16	15	8	12	11	20
Community Setting (Physical/Social)	43	29	35	32	25	20	24	36
Students (individually or as friends)	7	8	7	12	8	16	5	4
Students (generally e.g., "the students")	2	1	1	7	8		10	
Abstractions (such as "the Institution" - past and present)	3	7	5		2	4	5	4
Name of the College	10	15	13	10	15	20	18	16
Faculty	10	5	7	5	13	16	10	4
Phrases Revealing Negative Feelings	5		2	3	5		5	
A Place to Prepare for a Job	2		1/2					4

TOTAL SAMPLE SIZES

Westville	66
Sherwin	106
Freshmen	43
Seniors	38

Majors

Humanities	26
Social Sciences	78
Sciences	37

Table 2 (cont.)

II. The Administration: what identifies it?	N=58 Westville	N=90 Sherwin	Total%	N=43 Freshmen	N=36 Seniors	N=22 Humanities	N=62 Social Sciences	N=34 Sciences
Central Control, e.g. SUNY, Albany, Trustees	2	17	10	7	11	4	8	6
President (by name or title)	9	26	19	19	25	22	24	15
Various Administrative officers - identified (Deans, Business Managers, Resident Directors)	14	9	10	7	6	14	8	24
The Administration building and the people who work there	2	4	2	2	3			6
Various Academic or student service offices (registrar, bursar, placement, financial aid, etc.)	9	1	4		3		1	
Generalized: "People who are in control of things"	19	20	20	33	19	27	32	15
Faculty	19	1	8	16		5		15
Abstractions about "power", "red tape", "indifference", "bureaucracy", etc.	22	21	22	14	33	27	26	18
"The Administration"	2		1/2					3

Table 2 (cont.)

III. College Goals or Purposes: determined by whom?	N=57 Westville	N=106 Sherwin	Total%	N=37 Freshmen	N=33 Seniors	N=23 Humanities	N=60 Social Sciences	N=31 Sciences
Trustees or Central System	12	26	21	22	30	21	30	16
President		6	4	3	3	8	7	
Administration (power people)	25	27	25	24	20	26	33	33
Administration (service people)	2		1/2					
Department Chairmen		1	1/2		3		2	
Faculty	7	6	6	8	3	12	3	9
Students (as a group or organization)	23	15	18	22	18	26	10	26
Students (as individuals)	25	9	15	19	12	13	13	29
Various abstractions about social forces	4	2	2		3			3
Dean of Students	4		1					3
Negative Comments		4	4	2	3	9		
Alumni		2	2	1		4	2	

Table 2 (cont.)

IV. Educational Policy: who has the most say?	Westville	Sherwin	Total%	Freshmen	Seniors	Humanities	Social Sciences	Sciences
Central Control - SUNY, Trustees, etc.	6	12	10	15	8	3	16	7
President	11	12	11	9	8	10	12	8
Administrators	27	32	30	28	27	27	30	30
Administrators (Dean of Students)	9		4	2				3
Department Chairmen	5	11	8	5	8	16	8	7
Faculty	27	22	24	23	25	35	23	28
Students	13	10	11	15	12	14	11	15
Other		2	1	2	1	4	1	3
POINT SYSTEM - 3 pts. for First Place 2 pts. for Second Place 1 pts. for Third Place								
V. Educational Standing: who's responsible?	N=63	N=97		N=40	N=37	N=37	N=66	N=35
Central System, Trustees, etc.	6	7	7	5	8	3	8	9
President	8	2	4		3	6	3	6
Administration	8	13	11	10	5	9	17	9
Administration (Deans)	2		1/2					
Admissions Office	5	23	16	20		14	14	9
Departments	3	1	3/2			3	1	
Faculty	30	21	24	25	43	38	28	26
Students	38	33	35	40	47	30	30	43

Table 2 (cont.)

VI. College Calendar - other - who's responsible?	N=48 Westville	N=93 Sherwin	Total%	N=37 Freshmen	N=28 Seniors	N=14 Humanities	N=62 Social Sciences	N=28 Sciences
Central System	23	2	9	16	11		6	25
President	8	5	6	8	18		16	4
Administration	48	53	51	41	57	86	56	50
Administration (Deans)	4	6	6	8			8	
Departments	2	1	1					
Faculty	2	4	3 1/2	11		7	2	
Students	2	13	9	16	7	7	10	11
Registrar	8		3		7		4	7
Money	2		1/2					4
VII. Administration Contacts: where have you had them?	N=60	N=87		N=35	N=26	N=19	N=57	N=30
President								
Administration (Deans of students, freshmen, studies)	7	25	18	20	8	32	11	10
Administration (service; registrar, bursar, admissions, academic advising, financial aid, residence)	55	40	46	34	54	32	57	47
College committees or organized activities	3	3	3		4	10	2	
Various campus buildings or offices	15	5	9	11	12		5	17
Through student Government (direct or indirect)		3	2		4	5	4	
Through college reports or communications	2	5	3	3	4		5	3
Little or no contact	5	10	8	6	4	10	11	7
Department Officers	5	2	3	3	8			3
Security	3		1/2					
Faculty	5	6	5	11	4	10	5	7

Findings of the Study as reflected in
Administrative, Faculty and Student Statements
(Taken from group and individual interviews on campus)

TABLE 3

QUESTION #1: College Purposes for Undergraduate Education

Proposition: The first purpose of the college should be to give a broad education in the liberal arts and sciences, aiming at general intellectual growth and individual personal development.

	Administration	Faculty	Students
1.	(Sherwin) "Purpose number one is to offer a first-class liberal education in the classic sense of the word liberal education"	"Learning for the fun of learning"	"I think that what makes Sherwin special is that you have that choice--to be well-rounded or specialized"
2.	"I think that there is a tacit assumption that a lot of our best students are going to be fired with enthusiasm for the scholarly life"	"The ability to learn by themselves, to look at evidence, to be critical and analytical"	"I think that the purpose of a liberal arts college should be to give you a well-rounded education in a certain sense but not a superficial education"
3.	"One would like to think of Sherwin as making a contribution both by encouraging a sense of responsibility and by working in a sense against the grain of the academic community which so often divorces intellect from action"	"What I would really like to be doing is teaching them to think rather than to have their minds on horizons and all those things"	"Is that what we want from our education? You (i.e. middle-aged interviewer) had to learn History, English and you had to learn how to do this and that; but I think we are trying to look upon education in much broader terms"
4.	"If liberal arts is the fullest development of the capacities of an individual then women as well as men should be offered every opportunity to be developed as individuals. And I would assume that the leadership qualities would also emerge"		"I think that Sherwin emphasizes the individual, and the growth and potential of students, especially since you have to have special characteristics to be a Sherwin student"
5.			"A college purpose: to see to it that students have maximum freedom and responsibility on campus"
6.			"I think intellectually I'm more anxious to learn now. I've learned about new fields I want to pursue..."
7.			"...I have become much more independent. If you won't depend on yourself you are in a lot of trouble in a place like this"

Proposition: The first purpose of the college should be to give a broad education in the liberal arts and sciences, aiming at general intellectual growth and individual personal development.

Administration

1. **(Westville)** "Our purpose (is) to certify the acquisition of sufficient knowledge to merit the degrees awarded"

2. "I don't feel the students have a sense of what the liberal arts are concerned with"

3. "The main purpose of the college is to educate its students in the long run, rather than to, say, serve society"

4. "I think what those (students) were talking about that they weren't getting here has something to do with their self-development, which is part of a liberal education"

Faculty

1. "I and other individuals can interact with students so as to present to them certain material which they would not otherwise have been able to obtain

2. "To develop activities in problem-solving and decision-making"

3. "To give them a chance to think"

4. "It should include a heavy emphasis on comprehending the nature of society"

5. "One of the things I am interested in is that the courses help students in their ability to find self-identity"

6. "A great many of (our students) are from the lower middle class and college achievement is a relatively new idea. Much of our charge is to help people try different things until they say, 'I want to be such and such' "

Students

1. "In taking a lot of liberal arts courses I have some kind of an idea but as yet I am still experimenting"

2. "I think that's probably the main purpose of the college..to give students a chance to take a little of everything and find out for themselves what they are really interested in"

3. "I think that the majority of students want it to remain a liberal arts school ..a lot of people take general courses"

4. "College gives you a chance to meet very different types of people that you have never known before.You make different friends; different likes & dislikes, different customs, different cultures. It helps you here academically as well as socially..."

5. "I have come to the point where I am counseling people what I was like. I can understand it and also help people out and I also know my major now which helps a lot"

6. "I have taken so many different things that have opened up so many different areas"

7. (Interviewer ques.):"Have you changed?"
(Stud.Answer): "Well, I'm a little smarter"
(Interviewer):"From your courses or from your experiences?"
(Student): "Not from my courses; are you kidding?"

College Organization and Student Impact

Proposition: The utility of the liberal arts curriculum is under much controversy.

Administration

(Sherwin) "We don't find that we are not
1. preparing students for careers by educating them as people"

2. "I am not so sure with the increase in diverse and demanding professionalism that faculty will assume naturally that this is the essence of the responsibility of their 'calling' in a place like this"

Faculty

1 "The students in our department are not primarily concerned about vocational training"

2. "I deal with those students who are probably the most career-oriented...they are perhaps the single most anxiety-ridden students for very good reasons which have to do with their own competencies for the world. Many of them begin to see their studies as a liberal arts education and become very frustrated because of the pressures they have to deal with"

3. "I deal with a body of students who came in with a rather open-ended experimental attitude towards undergraduate education. I think that they are confused and uncertain"

4 "There is really no pretense of training them for a career"

5. "They are middle-class, well-to-do students and they come here because their parents told them that this is a ticket to get a good job"

6. "I am certain that a graduate from Sherwin has a far better chance to get into any law, medical or graduate school than any graduate from Westville for example. And to many parents it is worth $20,000 (sic) to achieve that"

Students

1 "I would say that (career preparation) is not the responsibility of the college. I am free to make a lot of mistakes"

2 "It should offer some kind of ideas, in terms of careers, what you might go on and conceivably do with the knowledge that you have supposedly accumulated here"

3 "Sherwin's goal is not and should not be a job or career placement, but its responsibility should be to have the advising here for those people who want that when they come here"

4 "Sherwin's resources are going to help you in choosing a career--but all the people that I see here are running around frantically. It seems that Sherwin implies that that is what it's going to do"

5 "What I don't like is that there isn't much emphasis on what you do after college. Career guidance I feel is lacking here -- preparation for job and career"

College Organization and Student Impact

Proposition: The utility of the liberal arts curriculum is under much controversy.

Administration	Faculty (continued)	Students
	(Sherwin)	
(See Page 40)	7. (Re: student fears about a job): "They are practically catatonic"	(See page 40)
	8. "I think if you go toSherwin you are going to be better able as a person and I think you are going to be worse prepared for a job"	
	9. "Requirements in assorted fields apart from the major field...seemed to me when I was a college student to force an unfruitful spread of a student's attention"	
	10. Sherwin has always been vocationally minded; the whole notion of liberal arts doesn't apply to professionals; that's why kids come here, to prepare for a vocation"	

College Organization and Student Impact

Proposition: The utility of the liberal arts curriculum is under much controversy.

Administration

(Westville) 1. "Many of the faculty know what (liberal education) means to them... many of them are graduates of private liberal arts colleges...our students generally don't come here with that same concept and therefore you start off with the first conflict of interest"

2. "While we are moving as fast as we can with certain kinds of career-oriented programs those may further dilute the liberal arts emphasis. We are going to continue the liberal arts and sciences base at the college as long as I am here which doesn't necessarily weaken career education..."

Faculty

1 "I think the thing that's being ignored...is what happens to the students after..."

2 "..Students tell me they have been told to go to college to get a better job"

3 "...to become narrowly career-oriented is a big mistake and we should resist this"

4 "There's a public educational policy of being profoundly pushed in that direction (vocationalism)"

5 "I'm all for education having a functional value, but on the other hand, when I look back on my own college days the value of that education wasn't immediately apparent when I got out"

6 "The college is pushing the business program...they believe the state is willing to support that kind of activity. I think it's unfortunate...it originates with the college because it originates in (the state capital)."

7. "I agree with faculty who believe that a more career-oriented curriculum is needed. This need not crowd out a liberal arts core--why can't we do both?"

Students

1. "I think this is the purpose of college. You decide what you want to do and then point yourself in that direction and gain from it"

2 "A college's purpose is to look at opportunities that you can pursue in the future"

3. "I don't think this college is highly career-oriented, but they leave it mostly up to the student. If you want to get a job, do well...They have placement offices..."

4 "They offer everything here. Employment Service, Career Opportunity...If this is what you want to do, here is how to handle it...how to handle an interview, how to look for a job"

5. "And intellectually, I learned how to motivate myself which took me a very long time...to be able to see long-range goals and still keep working without immediate rewards or reinforcements -- I think that causes a lot of the lack of motivation"

6 "I think a lot of people would be upset if Westville changed over to being a technical school"

7. "To have (vocationalism) become the prime goal of the school would be a mistake"

Proposition: Students place as highest faculty willingness to spend time in teaching students, with personal follow-through.

Administration

1 (Sherwin) "The obligation of the faculty member to be available to the student outside of the classroom in a variety of ways is made clear to job applicants"

2 "We have to have the faculty aware of the fact that the teaching function is a broader one than coming to their classes"

3 "I am not so sure with the increase in diverse and demanding professionalism that faculty will assume naturally that this is the essence of the responsibility of their 'calling' in a place like this"

4 "There may be some rare professor who thinks his duties discharged (by teaching classes and going home) but he is really terribly untypical of us. Altogether more typical of us is the faculty member who expects to play a big part in the life of the students outside the classroom as well as inside it"

5. "Very often you run into a comment: 'One problem that concerns me about the college:...I like academics but I would like to be part of a warmer community, one with more consideration'"

Faculty

1 "(Teaching here) involves an awful lot of direct student-faculty contact"

2 "There are very real pressures for some opportunity of leisure with the students - to share the creative activity that may be of a personal nature. I think our leave system recognizes that and in a way sort of builds on it"

3. "Of the two greatest obstacles that stand in the way of my doing what I want to do, one is numbers of students. I see teaching as very much a personal relationship with students and above a certain number threshold it becomes very hard to do it in the way in which I would like to do it"

4. "I think the only place that Sherwin can really differentiate itself from the other schools is in the relation between students and faculty. To have the faculty and students have this tremendously close contact is going to entail a totally different sense of the faculty..."

...Continued page 44..

Students

1. "When I came I was interested in drama and language and dance. I got a political science advisor who knew nothing about any of those things. Fortunately, I found faculty members who were willing to advise me on the side"

2 "We are so close, so in touch with members of the faculty: there are so few students per faculty member and there are no graduates. When they get excited by something, they share it and they don't just share it with professionals: they share it with their students & this is very good"

3 "One thing that has always bothered me: I have always sensed a lack of commitment on the part of the professors. They are always willing to talk with me but they don't like to go over departmental lines at all"

4. "From my personal experience most of them (the faculty) are willing to work with students and getting to know them personally; there seems to be at least in my classes a good rapport between teacher and students"

...Continued page 44...

College Organization and Student Impact

Proposition: Students place as highest faculty willingness to spend time in teaching students, with personal follow-through.

Administration

(Sherwin) (See page 43)

Faculty

(continued)

5. "We have more and more a percentage of the teachers commuting between (big city) and here; this has been a non-commuting campus"

6. "I think there are very few faculty and more particularly in the senior faculty who spend any time casually with a great variety of students"

7 "They (students) have to come in at 7:30 on a Saturday morning...This is some kind of professional setting up of 'I'll help you with this if you come in and if you don't then you don't need any help'"

8 "I think that from an administrative point of view this kind of activity (extra time with students) is not at all recognized"

Students

5 "Everybody's so personal...everybody just wants to know what you want to do. Anytime you want to have a conference with the teachers they are willing to have one..."

6 "I know there are a lot of faculty who never invite the students. I don't see that many activities on campus right now that are so interesting that they would entice faculty members to get involved"

7. "I think we have ample teaching faculty"

8 "There is so much pressure to publish that most of the faculty members just don't feel they have the time to participate in community problems..."

9 "The complaint here is that a larger percentage of the faculty isn't more active"

10 "This fall we tried to invite different faculty members to tea for the entire freshman class at the president's house and they got a very poor faculty response"

...Continued page45...

College Organization and Student Impact

Proposition: Students place as highest faculty willingness to spend time in teaching students, with personal follow-through.

Administration	Faculty	Students
(See page 43)	(See pages 43 and 44)	(Sherwin)- continued)
		11 "I have talked to several freshmen who found that faculty members pretend that they are really interested; they say, 'Oh yes, come in and make appointments and I'll have office hours between 10 and 12 on certain days.' And then the students go and they are not there"
		12. "Basically the role of a teacher in the college institution is to educate the students; I don't really see that publishing is going to enhance the faculty members' interaction with the students"
		13. "...maybe it should be the students who have to draw the faculty members into activities"

College Organization and Student Impact

Proposition: Students place as highest faculty willingness to spend time in teaching students, with personal follow-through.

Administration

(West-ville) 1. "I don't think the students feel much association with the faculty; they may"

2. "If the faculty and the students could get involved in the process which is the development of the student in the broad sense -- I think the students would be happier"

3. "If the faculty members were more open to the purposes of the college and if the students were more open to listen in this advisory relationship, then I think we would move forward a bit"

Faculty

1. "If a student feels any impact at this college it is that he remembers an experience with a (Colleague) or a (Colleague) or any one of us. It is that very close interrelationship which matters"

2 "What we are probably doing least well: providing informal communication between students and other subsets of the community, faculty and whatever"

3. "It is a question of getting a response from the students, getting involved...once we get that I think we are teaching"

Students

1 "Let the faculty come to us once in a while"

2 "I feel like I'm alienated from the faculty...look at last semester, the hot debates when they started talking about the proposal...And you talk about the students and faculty getting together? Well, definitely not"

3. "Whenever I have had a question for a faculty member, they have never been too busy to help me"

4 "From those I have met, I haven't met a professor I didn't really like -- that I was turned off by"

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Proposition: There is little agreement among students, faculty and administrators about what the college organization means or what it comprises.

Administration

1. (Sherwin) "There is a crying need for leadership in the world today but I think one tries to do it partly by example, partly by models, partly by indirect stimulation rather than the explicit method"

2. "(Leadership) flows from simple constant reminders that are given the students about responsibilities, or even more particularly about opportunities that are theirs having come from a place like Sherwin"

3. "Of course (the faculty) are the source of inspiration; on the other hand... (the administration) has the environment that makes this (social idealism) possible"

Faculty

1. "It's essentially a private thing between student and faculty and the less administration there is...the more individuality there is in how a teacher teaches, and how a student does"

2. "These ideas (administrative ideas on how money should be spent) may be incompatible with what the individual faculty or groups of faculty wish to do. So this aspect in a very practical sense interferes..."

3. "A college is essentially its faculty... it's an academic experience"

4. "If you have a problem, the Administration should administer and resolve that problem"

5. "...financial soundness is the (administration's) goal"

6. "Quality of education, what kind of working environment does the faculty have, questions like these are never asked. Rather it's how much money are we going to save here or there"

7. "In place of cooperativeness there is co-option and that is a major transformation and not a nice one it seems to me"

Students

1. "You have to know where the administration is on different issues; they should continue to do that, or they should start doing it more often"

2. "If they are interested in cutting costs, do it by cutting down on the bureaucratization..."

3. "One of the problems of Sherwin is that people become institutions... people are very sensitive to (i.e. troubled by) change"

...continued page 48...

Proposition: There is little agreement among students, faculty and administrators about what the college organization means or what it comprises.

Administration

(Sherwin) (see page 47)

Faculty (continued)

8 "We are not only the workers in this corporation but also the goods... our position in the college (is) a double-edged one which I am not sure is ever fully recognized by the administration or boards of trustees. I think that is what most of all makes us angry...ultimately *we* are the college."

9 "It seems to me the concept of administration at Sherwin was of a much more cooperative venture 20 years ago...A place like Sherwin College has come to administration simply later in a certain real way than other colleges"

10. "There is no coherence, no unity between students and faculty and administrators and this is as I see it what has happened here"

Students

(see page 47)

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Proposition: There is little agreement among students, faculty and administrators about what the college organization means or what it comprises.

Administration

(Westville) ↑ " I'm not certain that our kind of administrative organization is really most effective for accomplishing what we want"

2. "We are different from a private college or many public colleges in that we are part of a system, and being part of a system we have certain designated purposes"

3 "One thing we don't do very well is to organize in such a way as to have everyone informed with the notion that we are here to serve students, in one way or another"

4 "I have heard the criticism that the mission of the campus is not clearly defined, but in our (state system plan) we have defined it about as clearly as we can, given the designation we have as an 'arts and sciences' college"

5. "It is sort of a local purpose - to get the kind of organization that will mobilize human resources, to get a collegiality that we think existed in the past in the institutions of higher education"

...continued page 50...

Faculty

1. "It seems to me that when an organization attempts to define its function the natural thing would be to do it in a way... easy to measure:

2. "If anything, organization gets in the way of either defining purpose or carrying out purpose"

3 "Institutions grow best when they are left alone"

4. "I don't think that there is any clearly enunciated overall college sense of mission, purposes and goals"

(Re: global perspective in education)
5. "It is a very significant objective, something I wish we could accomplish. It is not occurring; and one of the reasons why is, it isn't coming from the top" (i.e. from Central State System)

Students

1. "I came here for a little pre-orientation and the president gave a speech to us about the school, the Dean of Students came in...But now, no one is out there talking to anybody anymore..."

2 "The Dean of Students does get himself organized with the student body. He is one of the few I have seen do it."

3 "I would get things done more efficiently"

4 "I see no real control or direction from State Central on this campus at all"

5. "A lot of people feel that (the president) isn't responding to the needs of the college community"

6 "The ultimate decision is the president's, but the majority of times he'll just let the decisions of the committees ride unless they really go against what he wants"

...continued page 50 ..

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Proposition: There is little agreement among students, faculty and administrators about what the college organization means or what it comprises.

Administration	Faculty	Students
Westville - continued		
6 "It is up to the administration to assess the various needs of the college and to be aware and concerned about student needs and interests, and to the extent that we fail to do that it is not the faculty but we who are at fault, for our failure to be courageous, insightful and visionary"	(See page 49)	7 "(The president) leaves us mostly on our own. And he does that with most groups of the college -- faculty students, he leaves them on their own. He doesn't provide direction. We really haven't had a college-wide governance in years, and he's attacking the problem by waiting for the faculty to get together, waiti[illegible] for the students to get tog[illegible]."
7 "The exercise of developing judgment and skill at decision-making; the efforts to involve students in college-wide questions to help them to develop the broader view in understanding and appreciation of differences of points of view..."		

79

78

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Administrative - Faculty relations in the college organization

Administration

(Sherwin) "Sherwin governance says that the faculty share with the administration the responsibility for the well-being of the residential life at Sherwin" 1

2 "I wouldn't want to suggest that our record has just been of loving kindness; there have been divisions and battles."

3 "The essence of the conference procedure is that faculty can have a conference any time they want; they will be listened to patiently and hopefully intelligently but they are then excused and the trustees confer among themselves as to what the decision on that issue should be -- and they make the decision"

4 "Not only in the classroom but outside the classroom, the faculty do have great influence within the framework of Sherwin governance, and I think perceptive students are conscious of that"

5 "Just because it is known that the faculty share power with the administration and with the trustees in the governing of the college on a lot of issues of non-classroom content which can arise at any time, the student knows that the faculty probably has a view about that and will certainly have a voice about it"

...continued on page 52...

Faculty

1 "To be able to teach effectively, there must be compatibility of educational philosophy and educational practice"

2 "...Here there is a sense of the enemy being within us.. That if we are to overhaul this place we must overhaul it from within and it's very hard when the enemy is not from outside, but your superiors, that these people who run this place to make you happy, or to make you leave...that there is something wrong that you cannot put your finger on."

3 "I feel very clearly that faculty should have a real input into resource allocation. I don't think they should have it totally"

4 "I do think that the faculty used to take a more decisive role in shaping educational policy and it does not do so anymore"

5 "(There has been)...an attempt to recapture some of the authority and power that the faculty in effect gave away"

...continued on page 52...

Students

1 "A lot of faculty members see students that are sitting on committees and other leaders as being co-opted by the administration"

2 "I don't always see the faculty taking as much of a leadership position or getting themselves included as much as I would hope, except to protect their own narrow interests as far as wages go and their own positions of power on joint committees."

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Administrative - Faculty relations in the college organization

Administration	Faculty	Students
(Sherwin - continued)	(continued)	
6. "I would say it (i.e. the financial crunch) has certainly changed the relationship in a completely positive way and they (the faculty) have a sense of working together with us, the administration"	6. "I have never yet seen an evaluation used to keep someone here; it's usually used not to keep someone. However you can always find a reason to keep those you want"	
7 "By the governance the faculty committee has the right to make a recommendation but it is essentially powerless to make its voice effective"	7. "Faculty role in educational policy making has been pre-empted in recent years by the administration, in response in part to student demands."	
8 "It is the opinion of the members of this year's committee that the faculty must invest in more effective ways..."	8 "In the committee I am on there is very little real contact between the people who are running the college and the people who work in the college."	
9 "What the Sherwin governance provides for is faculty input; it doesn't provide for negotiation. The operative verb that is used is 'advise'"	9 "The trustees have a different kind of notion in mind of what the good education is but that has nothing to do with this group's notion of good education"	

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Administrative - Faculty relations in the college organization

Administration

(Westville) 1 " I think the faculty of this college wants to feel a pride in its association with the college... We need new constructive kinds of projects which receive favorable coverage in the media as one way of recreating our sense of pride or giving people a basis for expressing it."

2 "I am sure that our students believe that the administration has the authority and the obligation to shape academic policy, and that many of their frustrations result from the belief that the administration is too heavily influenced by the faculty."

3 "None of the changes that I can recall-any major changes having to do with the academic program, changes in requirements, changes in types of courses that were offered were made without faculty consultation and the governance system that existed at the time, and to some extent now. That was a matter of the entire faculty sitting at a meeting and voting. I have listened to faculty members five and six years later that would suggest faculty wasn't even consulted..."

...continued page 54...

Faculty

1 "What I am most afraid of is organized organization. I would much prefer disorganized organization"

2 "There is nowhere near enough dialogue between faculty, between departments"

3 "I guess the conclusion that I would draw is that we are not agreed on the purposes of this institution"

4 "I would like to see an entirely different spirit of cooperation and a much greater interaction between faculty, and departments and especially to get together and say, all right, what can we do for each other's natives so that they can come out better educated than any other school?"

5 "We are pretty lucky here because our administration is rather light-handed"

6 "I'm looking for more leadership than we have now. But the leadership we have now can only distort the present situation. I'm not condemning the present president; he can't do anything else much but exist here."

...continued page 54 ...

Students

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Administrative - Faculty relations in the college organization

Administration	Faculty	Students
(Westville - continued)	(Continued)	
4 "There were a number of faculty during times of difficulty, faculty who were concerned about students' needs and interests, seemed to come to the fore and worked very closely with students and administration in effecting changes."	7 "In the years I've been here one of the things that New Paltz has suffered from is the lack of a top admininstrator who could set priorities and goals over a reasonably long term"	
	8 "(The Administration) is not responsive to students or to intellectual initiative"	
	9. "Recently from what I hear, and what I see about governance and college structure...somehow I feel that they lose sight of the college and it seems to get very political" (This is in reference to faculty colleagues)	

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Student Roles in the college organization

Administration

(Sherwin) 1. "For the last three years we have really had a very responsible student government that has worked very hard at the whole business of making judgments and taking leadership"

2. "The degree of participation in decisions of all kings, at every level that the college makes is made almost unique at Sherwin in terms of the responsibility given into the hands of students"

3 "Students are probably conscious of the fact that the government of Sherwin College is organized on an R principle -- rank rather than line (i.e., Etzioni's classification). It may be that what impresses students is that there is a good deal of joint responsibility for decision-making at Sherwin College. I think any perceptive student would be aware of that"

4. "What we are now talking about here -- namely student participation in college government in the most important sense of the word -- is no older than the last five or six years"

5. "Student and faculty were natural allies in whatever the current little conflict might be with the administration or the administration and the trustees. That in today's financial crunch is no longer so true"

Faculty

1. "If there is a problem that the students aren't properly prepared (to deal with) then the administration should at least go forward in trying to determine ways that problem can be resolved"

Students

1. "I think that students should be regarded as a separate entity in the corporate structure of the college. This is something that students fought very hard to get; we are regarded that way in the governing..."

2. "You are given the opportunity to sit on this committee to have power, but it is how we use it -- that really determines how much influence we have"

3 "The fact (is) that things are determined mostly by the faculty and that's one thing that I've found very frustrating"

4 "I thought there would be more interaction between Student Government and the faculty on how decisions are made"

5. "I feel I would put more responsibility for the upkeep of the school on the students, to take more pride in the school"

6. "I feel the students are really irresponsible about (who is) running the school, because it is their school and they are paying a lot to go here"

7. "I am quite content to live on the fringes of decisions and let things happen so long as I am able to just make my personal changes and get myself together"

...continued page 56...

College Organization and Student Impact

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Student Roles in the college organization

Administration	Faculty	Students
(See page 55)	(See page 55)	(Sherwin - continued) 8. "...there is no consensus on what the purposes, or the roles or the values of the college as a college body should be, and (there is opinion) that the masses have been pacified by having student members on student committees...and the people who really have the power keep the power" 9. "...if we had to join a Faculty-Student Senate I can almost guarantee you that the faculty would take over" 10. "Students do have input into that (tenure). The Majors Committee - when they act together, they really have a voice, I think..." 11. "The S.A.C. Recommendation may be crucial in determining tenure." (Student Advisory Committee) 12. "When you don't fight back, how seriously are you taken by the administration? It is very hard for student leaders not to appear to have sold out."

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Student Roles in the college organization

Administration	Faculty	Students
(Westville) 1. "The College is for students; it is not here to be run by students."	1. "The organization I would like to see should consist of both faculty and student delegates -- a 2:1 ratio of faculty to students; I think the students are important in terms of presenting the recipients' view and the faculty in terms of continuity and the producers' views"	1. "I'll give you an example of this proposal that we had: that the students should have a voice in the government. What happened was that faculty were afraid of students and what they were saying."
2. "...our objective is to create an environment in which a student can be increasingly responsible for his or her own judgment."		2. "It is hard to get on committees. The people are already on the committees and I imagine stay there."
		3 "I find that when things really come down hard and students begin to start feeling it by that time it may be too late. They rally around for a little while and then they dissipate."
		4. "Why is it that we never hear why the students never got a voice or the power to vote on something as major as money (or) whether to hold onto a teacher?"
		5. "We have been going through a heck of a lot of red tape and we have been dying to talk it over the the president of the college"
		6 "The channels are here to get -- for students to accomplish a lot and there are many ways to get activities going, to get organizations running and I think the students have a pretty good voice here except for governmentally..."
		7. "...but students have a pretty good thing here as far as getting things done. Academically you can get things done for innovative studies."

...continued page 58 ...

QUESTION #2: Perceptions of the College Organization

Re: Student Roles in the college organization

Administration	Faculty	Students (Westville - continued)
(see page 57)	(see page 57)	8 "Student committees discuss and make policy recommendations: basically that is the way that the college-wide government is being run here. There is no college-wide governance. Even the faculty doesn't have governance that is operating." 9 "I feel we can do a lot on this campus as far as influencing administrators and bringing about change. And it's just a matter of involvement on the part of the students..." 10. "We have effectively no student government... that's mostly the students' fault...because we don't have a student government, whatever the administration says -- that's what we get. (Helpful agents): myself, the professors, my friends. (The Organization?) -- It hasn't held me back but it hasn't advanced me"

QUESTION #3: College Organization impact on students

Propostion: Given the constraints of an uncertain organization theory as well as exceptions on the plus side, college organization is seen by most students and faculty to have a negative impact on students.

Administration

(Sherwin)

1. "Tradition certainly is something that differentiates Sherwin from many other institutions that have the capacity to offer the same kind of liberal education in the mechanical sense that we do"

2. "It is a never-ending struggle to try to make (the residence halls) more than just a place to sleep in"

3. "We have a College Center which goes virtually around the clock and as soon as the additional library is finished, an intellectual counterpart to that in a Reserve Room is going to be opened around the clock and the place simply functions."

4. "(Visitor): Do you think students are conscious of these college purposes for them...(i.e., leadership, belief in college traditions)?
(Administrator): Yes, I really do."

5. "Students are probably conscious of the fact that the government of Sherwin College is organized on an R principle - rank rather than line (i.e. Etzioni's classification); it may be that what impresses students is that there is a good deal of joint responsibility for decision-making at Sherwin College"

...continued page 60..

Faculty

1 "Every administration has an effect on the education of the institution, very decisively. That calls for challenges on the part of the faculty for shoring up frameworks in which one can function in the way individually he wants"

2 It's essentially a private thing between student and faculty and the less administration there is...the more individuality there is in how a teacher teaches, and how a student does"

3. "Students are affected by the organization when they become interested in political process for getting changes on campus in their favor"

4 "(Organization) has an impact on them by determining policies increasingly according to administrative concerns (financial) rather than by faculty concerns (education)"

5. "I think it is not so much negative as neutral, and it ought not be neutral -- in fact if it was negative, they would have something to respond against"

...continued page 60...

Students

1 "I think that the organization of the school reflects the type of courses that are taught"

2. "The lack of college organization has had a positive impact"

3 "The organization -- concerning tenure and everything -- I think has a direct impact on me...on who gets tenure and how they go about it"

4 "One of the problems of Sherwin is that people become institutions...people are very sensitive to (i.e. troubled by) change"

5 "I find that most of the officials are very closed and hesitant and unwilling to give you honest free answers about why things are run the way they are"

6 "They like the people a lot more here.... The administration and everybody else, they put on their best, I mean they really try"

...continued page 60...

QUESTION #3: College Organization impact on students

Proposition: Given the constraints of an uncertain organization theory as well as exceptions on the plus side, college organization is seen by most students and faculty to have a negative impact on students.

Administration

(Sherwin - continued)

6 "I would suspect that students in a comparatively small residential college are going to be more aware of organization than the students in a college where there are many commuters in the student body or in the larger universities"

7. "The interpersonal relationships are important to the student and the general air of this is in the common everyday way of doing business"

Faculty

(continued)

6 "The way in which the college governs itself is an important part of a liberal education"

7 "People think that organization has an impact on who is hired, which students are brought here. But there are more things...the climate for the student. Are there a lot of library resources, are administrative hassles at a minimum level for student and faculty - and how about tradition?"

8 "Ill-considered decisions have had a certain amount of detrimental impact for student-faculty-administration relations"

Students

7 "(Re the bureaucracy): I think that a lot of the people that work here have a negative attitude towards the school. A lot of the secretaries are very caught up in the bureaucracy and don't have time for you often..."

8 "I have liked the academic freedom, the contact with teachers, being able to work things out with people; how am I going to take the test, am I going to take a typewriter there, etc...just little things like that I find somewhat easy to work out...whereas at a school any larger, forget it..."

9 "There is a sort of funny thing about this Sherwin elitism..when you really work hard on a 20-page paper and get a C you sort of get bitter towards everybody. This tradition has sort of made me want to work harder for the benefit of the school...I really like it here, the tradition and all.."

10 "...Oh, yes, how the college is put together; I think it has a very strong effect on my education"

QUESTION #3: College Organization impact on students

Proposition: Given the constraints of an uncertain organization theory as well as exceptions on the plus side, college organization is seen by most students and faculty to have a negative impact on students.

Administration

(Westville) 1. "I don't really think students have much awareness of the significance of organization of the faculty. I don't think that has much impact on them at all"

2 "With respect to how students are affected by the organization at the top levels of administration...I was told the other day that most students don't know our names"

3. "In an educational institution, the faculty establishes a tradition: a tradition that builds a fact of identity of the institution, not only in older institutions but in those having a late start"

4 "This student body cannot and never will have a sense of community because it comes together for anti-communitarian purposes...and I don't think, being a state institution and therefore being identified with the state as supplying a service, that we can really expect to mold a student body with any sense of community."

5. "(Someone has asked:) 'What makes the college real for the student?' And to me that is the question. What makes it real for the student?"

6. "I suspect that the organization that most affects students is the lower-level organization, not the organization in this room"

...continued page 62...

Faculty

1 "(The Organization) is a structure which I believe impedes what I am trying to do in my teaching. I believe that students do perceive that college organization separates classes from residential life and that what they learn officially is not supposed to be interesting and engaging"

2 "I think that one of the biggest impacts has to do with these different interpersonal relationships -- where students learn to be adults. Now it may be the result of the organization of the college -- it may not"

3 "I think most of us can remember with some fondness if not affection our own undergraduate education. You don't find this institution creating such an ethos. I think size and organizational patterns have something to do with that"

4 "I would feel that if anything, organization gets in the way of either defining purpose or carrying out purpose"

5 "(The Administration) is not responsive to students or to intellectual initiative" (cont. p. 62)

Students

1. "It depends on the individual more than the administration or faculty. It is up to you to get the best information. They are not going to lead you by the hand"

2. "At this college, which is I think different from a lot of colleges, you can go into town and the town has a community there that will accept you..."

3 "Just the way it is here. Like with the people living the way they do and the way we are supposed to be going to classes, the way they (the administration) set up the system for us to follow"

4 "I think mainly it didn't come from the administrafion or the faculty; the changes came from the people I met here"

5. "The college organization -- I have heard so much that is bad about it... I read the (student weekly newspaper)

...continued page 62...

College Organization and Student Impact

QUESTION #3: College Organization impact on students

Proposition: Given the constraints of an uncertain organization theory as well as exceptions on the plus side, college organization is seen by most students and faculty to have a negative impact on students.

Administration

(Westville - continued)

7 "The past framework for thinking about these institutions of higher education simply does not work these days...how we are organized doesn't make that much difference; those who have a variety of interests will eke out of the institution those things which satisfy their interests irrespective of how we are put together"

8 "By and large I don't think (student) awareness or lack of awareness of college administrative organization has any bearing on their response to the educational program as a whole. It's only when the organization stands in their way that it might have that kind of effect"

9 "Certainly the administration has a direct, maybe it's an indirect, part to play in making an educational impact on students by its decisions regarding development of new programs and the curtailing of old ones. It may well have an educational impact to the extent that it can convey to students a sense for the educational and social system within which the college has to function"

...continued page 63...

Faculty

(continued)

6 "The students get a tired or grey feeling...a lot of little, simple logistics have added up to the point that people don't even realize that these little logistical problems are causing this general grey feeling"

7 "No. Impact is being weakened by splits in faculty and inadequate college follow-through on career placement"

8 "I think organization has more of an impact on the student's education and values through these imponderables, through the attitude of the people rather than through the exact structure"

9 "A surreptitious kind of thing" (Re: organization impact)

10 "A negative impact from inefficient bureaucracy"

11 "Not really; it varies among students, but the integrity of the institution is being compounded by central state pressures toward vocational purposes"

...continued page 63...

Students

(continued)

6 "I don't think the college set-up has anything to do with it. It is just the person. The college itself has a lousy system"

7 "I really have no complaints... college is what you make it"

8 "I feel that the college organization is mostly faculty and administrators and they do have an impact on your education and they do set standards...honor standards and admissions standards...The type of people you get at a certain school is what their standards are and I think that has an impact on the kind of education you get"

9 "The administration says Yes, we'll do it, but you have to climb the Empire State Building to do it"

10 "I don't really feel that the bureaucracy is holding me back yet; I haven't been as exposed to it as some people that I know. I have things pretty well organized. I have an advisor who has helped me choose some ways and means of getting what I ultimately want to get"

QUESTION #3: College Organization impact on students

Proposition: Given the constraints of an uncertain organization theory as well as exceptions on the plus side, college organization is seen by most students and faculty to have a negative impact on students.

Administration

(Westville - continued)

10 "I think as a general matter that students are not aware of the organization of the college, by that we mean an appreciation of how things are structured to accomplish certain purposes"

11 "I continue to believe that the role of people on the staff - well, that can be as simple as the way in which they deal with students in an office situation - the whole range of kings of things that are done in student affairs will contribute to the kind of person that student is going to be"

12 "It would be my guess that liberal arts students would be perhaps less purposeful and less motivated to pursue one particular thing: they're a bit looser, and they may have some perceptions of the place as some kind of loose, casual place where they must decide what to do for themselves. So the impact of the college on them, I think, is different"

13 "My sense is generally that there is a kind of apathy toward the organization, towards institutions in general among students...I sense that that is more a response to the organization of the college than a hostile response"

...continued page 64..

Faculty

(continued)

12 "A small minority of students are aware of and responsive to the organization...a large majority don't think about how the organization runs"

13 "College can influence students by widening opportunities; but the main impact is via department and faculty guidance. A strong president makes personal impact but it is not necessarily spread to the institution, nor do the students feel it personally. The faculty do, however."

14 "Yes, governance implants feelings about educational values (but not necessarily for the better)"

Students

(see pages 61 - 62)

College Organization and Student Impact

QUESTION #3: College Organization impact on students

Proposition: Given the constraints of an uncertain organization theory as well as exceptions on the plus side, college organization is seen by most students and faculty to have a negative impact on students.

Administration	Faculty	Students
(Westville - continued)	(see pages 61 - 63)	(see pages 61 - 62)

"Representation of student interests
and student attitudes has not been
very effective within recent years; I
am left with the impression that loyalty
14 in a traditional sense may not exist;
but I am very much convinced that students continue to have an investment in
what happens at the college...in terms
of what it means to go on with their
education"

(Re: Traditional college events):
"I have not observed any such rituals
15. or symbols that draw students together.
This is not a school that nourishes
traditions like these"

Representative Viewpoints on the Quality of the College Experience

Administration

(Sherwin) 1 "What strikes us today is how much more diverse we are now than we were ten years ago. We pride ourselves on our diversity"

2 "The Sherwin faculty in terms of compensation is a highly privileged faculty. It has compensation which is about the third or fourth highest among all the liberal arts colleges in the country . Housing (aid) is very attractive... The leave system is the most generous I know of. So it is not as if you are talking about people who have been terribly hard pressed"

3 "We made a very conscious decision about eleven years ago to expand the diversity of our student body and I think this has enriched the curricula no end in the classroom"

4 "Tradition certainly is something that differentiates Sherwin from many other institutions that have the capacity to offer the same kind of liberal education in the mechanical sense that we do"

Faculty

1 "A concern for the responsibility in humanistic education is very strong at Sherwin"

2 "One of the things that's bad about Sherwin in terms of teaching: you don't have time to do anything else -- all I have time to do is teach and play housemother...I never have enough time to do my own work"

3 "I think that pursuing a very active science research career at Sherwin is relatively difficult because of its isolation"

4 "I have always been interested in teaching in a liberal arts college; teaching gifted students, interested students, teaching on a faculty of people who are highly qualified professionally - and that meant Sherwin was a reasonable place for me to accept an appointment"

5 "There has been a lot of internal criticism here about the lack of community"

6 "...except I don't believe that the education people get at Sherwin is necessarily superior to the education that one gets at a great State University"

...continued page 66..

Students

1 "Their focus is more on getting parity of numbers (i.e. coeducation) as opposed to the quality of education that they are giving"

2 "I think that Sherwin gives a superficial education by trying to throw in too much too fast, and not letting you soak it all in"

3 "I think a great deal of the responsibility (for faculty-student relations) rests on the shoulders of the students which they are just not accepting"

4 "This is also one of the reasons that I tried to come to a small school. I thought that living in a community of not only students but also faculty members would be very beneficial to me in the educational experience"

5 "It is great to have variety but you need to have something underneath: there has to be a base: a social base or whatever you call it as well as having all these little tangents that people go out on. I think that maybe there's too much of a variety or something, I am not sure"

...continued page 66 ..

Representative Viewpoints on the Quality of the College Experience

Administration

(see page 65)

Faculty

(Sherwin - continued)

7 "I think that the quality of work here has often been gauged according to quantity"

8 "A tremendous number of women from Sherwin have made great contributions to society ..writers, ambassadors, etc. But I am not sure that it is due to the impact of Sherwin"

9 "I think that our attempt to make a 'place' here has failed so far"

10 "Students see their roles or their place in society afterward much differently than students did in the 50's or in the early 60's. Sherwin has not adjusted to that at all; it is still teaching as it was then"

Students

(continued)

6 "They work us harder here because of...you know, when they brought men in, some people said Sherwin has gone down...they are just working us hard and I am not sure that some of the work is teaching us all that much"

7 "I pay $6000 a year probably because I have to fly back and forth...and it is a small enough college that you should have more individual attention"

8 "Sherwin's social atmosphere is strange; it causes people a lot of problems; you have to learn to adjust and it's not an easy school to go to"

9 "Everybody feels tense, it creates too much competition -- ego-building, social pressures...it's not a natural atmosphere"

10 "The first thing that impressed me was the landscaping, the trees, I love the type of architecture very much. I also found myself very responsive to the atmosphere"

...continued page 67...

Representative Viewpoints on the Quality of the College Experience

Administration	Faculty	Students
(see page 65)	(see pages 65 - 66)	(Sherwin - continued)
		11 "And intellectually I've grown. Probably what has had that effect is that I'm with students all the time. It's just sort of an intellectual environment"
		12 "You can't help but grow. If you put the effort into it, you are bound to learn something"
		13 "The stress here is so heavy on academics and there isn't enough emphasis on other group things, sports, arts, the whole dimension of education where people can loosen, expand, get together"
		14 "When I first came here I was really intimidated; I said, I must be really dumb because of all these smart people. But after having been here a while, it's not that they're smart; they just put on those knowing looks"

Representative Viewpoints on the Quality of the College Experience

Administration

(Westville)

1 "The teachers are good and the classes are fine but somehow I don't like the college" (Quote by student) (Administrator comment): "I don't know what that means"

2. "This student body cannot and never will have a sense of community because it comes together for anti-communitarian purposes...and I don't think, being a state institution and therefore being identified with the state as supplying a service, that we can really expect to mold a student body with any sense of community"

3 "Part of the students' problems is their lacking of purpose. They have ability, they individually have certain interests, but they really have no particular purpose in being here"

4. "I think there is a sense in which Westville students tend to believe a certain mythology about student aggressiveness in taking over buildings, campus activism, etc. -- so they aspire towards an image of themselves as sophisticated and active"

Faculty

1 "I would like to see an entirely different spirit of cooperation and a much greater interaction between faculty and departments and especially to get together and say, all right, what can we do for each other's natives so that they can come out better educated than any other school?"

2 "On the one hand, the faculty want to hold onto their power and on the other hand there are the students who want power, and what gets lost in the process is the sight of the real goal -- educational quality"

3 "On the one hand they want to maintain a solid atmosphere of people doing research and being active in their disciplines; on the other hand they are getting more and more students who need remedial work, and it is very hard to be pulled in both directions"

4 "I don't like the attitudes that go with students who come into an elite institution and I feel very strongly the importance of a state education which makes education of real quality available to students"

Students

1. "One thing I have noticed is that math and science departments are way ahead of the other departments -- they are tough, they demand work."

2 "This college offers so much to learn from so many different people. There are so many different kinds of experiences that these people have that you can take advantage of"

3 "After 11 p.m. -- there is really no place except to go back to the dorms. Other colleges have a lot of clubs with dancing but here kids are expected to go home because we are near a big city"

4 "There is a lot offered here -- choir, intramurals, but they should have more on weekends"

5. "Well, it is (reputedly) a party school"

6 "I think it lived up to its reputation in the sixties. I think it is much improved now"

6a. "I feel very good about the academics here...I know we have a number of departments which have excellent reputations and I say they are worthy of their reputation"

...continued page 69...

Representative Viewpoints on the Quality of the College Experience

Administration	Faculty	Students
(see page 68)	(see page 68)	7 "...it is giving me an education that not everybody in the outside world has. There are certain things I am studying that may be esoteric to other people - it will give me a better chance in the real world so to speak"
		8 "A lot of heavy things happen, bad things -- rip-offs, rapes; I don't dig that part of it. It is kind of heavy around here at times"
		9 "The thing I like least about it is the apathetic attitude of the students; that there is no school spirit. Too many people are too much into parties and they really don't get down to studying at all"
		10 "Definitely the upkeep of the dorms should be better with more money and I think they should widen the library -- enlarge it"
		11 "I would like to transfer to a school where people don't go home as often as they do here...all of my life I wanted to go to a homecoming and to come here and find out we don't even have a football team...there is nothing really, or not much to get involved in"
		12 "Most people like Westville because they can do whatever they want to. If they don't want to go to classes, they don't have to go; basically they're all-right classes. You can get an education. But you can also do whatever else you want. And I think that's why most people enjoy being here"
		13 "I think that one of the best aspects about this campus that most students enjoy is outside the classroom. It's a nice area to be in, they have a lot to offer in the area, the town is nice, the people are nice..."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris, On Organizations of the Future, edited by H. George Frederickson, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, No. 03-006, Sage Publications, Inc., Beverly Hills, 1973, 48 pp.

Astin, Alexander W., "Measuring Student Outcomes in Higher Education", Chapter from The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, July 1970, 9 pp.

Baldridge, J. Victor, Academic Governance, Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, 1971.

---, Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1971.

Barton, Allen H., Organization Measurement and Its Bearing on the Study of College Environments, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1961.

Benezet, Louis T., "A Frontal Approach to College Impact", Liberal Education, Vol. LXI, No. 4, December, 1975, 8 pp.

Boroff, David, Campus U. S. A., Harper and Sons, New York, 1961.

Chickering, Arthur W., Education and Identity, Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1969.

Clark, Burton, The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore, Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1970.

----- and Martin Trow, Chapter in College Peer Groups, edited by Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson, Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1966, page 68.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1974.

Corson, John J., Governance of Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1975.

Epstein, Leon D., Governing the University, Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1974.

Etzioni, Amitai, Modern Organizations, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1964.

Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students, Volume I: An Analysis of Four Decades of Research, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Graubard, Stephen R., American Higher Education: Toward an Uncertain Future, Two Volumes, Daedalus, Volume I: Fall, 1974, Vol. 103, No. 4; Volume II: Winter, 1975, Vol. 104, No. 1; Richmond, 1974 - 75.

Gross, Edward and P. Grambsch, Changes in University Organization, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1974

Handlin, Oscar and Mary F. Handlin, The American College and American Culture, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1970.

Howe, Harold, "The Trouble with Research in Education", Change Magazine, Volume 8, No. 7, August 1976, page 47.

Jacobs, Philip E., Changing Values in College, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1957.

Keniston, Kenneth, "The Sources of Student Dissent", in Academic Governance by J. Victor Baldridge, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, 1971, Page 358, Part 4.

Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset, The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1975.

Little, Graham, The University Experience: An Australian Study, Melbourne University Press, Victoria, 1970.

Newcomb, Theodore M., "What Does College Do For a Person? -- Frankly, Very Little", Psychology Today, No. 8, September 1974, page 72.

---, Kathryn E. Koenig, Richard Flacks and Donald P. Warwick, Persistence" and Change: Bennington College and Its Students After 25 Years, Wiley Publishing Company, New York, 1967.

Pace, C. Robert, "A Contextual Model for Evaluating the Impress of College on Students", Report for the Spencer Foundation Research Committee, Graduate School of Education, UCLA, Los Angeles, October, 1975, unpublished.

---, They Went To College, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1941.

Parsons, Talcott and G. M. Platt, The American University, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1973.

---, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1960.

Perkins, James A., editor, The University as an Organization, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1973.

Perrow, Charles, Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay, Scott Foresman, Glenview, 1972, 224 pages.

Riesman, David and Joseph R. Gusfield, Academic Value and Mass Education, Doubleday and Co., New York, 1970.

Riesman, David and Verne A. Stadtman, Academic Transformation, Seven Institutions under Pressure, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1973.

Sanford, Nevitt, editor, College and Character, (A briefer version of The American College), John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1964.

Spaeth, Joseph L. and Andrew M. Greeley, Recent Alumni and Higher Education: A Survey of College Graduates, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1975.

Trow, Martin, editor, Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1975.

---, "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education", Daedalus, Vol. 99, No. 1, Winter, 1970, page 1 - 42.

Tunis, John R., Was College Worthwhile?, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1936.